DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 175 189 EC 120 053

AUTHOR Macy, Daniel J.; And Others
TITLE In Retrospect: 1977-78. Special Education Research.
INSTITUTION Dallas Independent School District, Tex. Dept. of Research and Evaluation.
PUB DATE Jan 79
NOTE 104p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Programs; Elementary Secondary Education; Emotionally Disturbed; *Handicapped Children; *Identification; *Individualized Programs; *Program Evaluation; *State Programs
IDENTIFIERS *Texas

ABSTRACT

The document contains a composite of the summaries written for every Texas special education research and evaluation project in the 1977-78 school year. Sections address the following projects: Evaluation of the Implementation of Individualized Educational Plans, Project Help-Screening, Project KIDS (Kindling Individual Development Systems), Project KIDS Theoretical Control Study, Project Zero Reject-Child Find, Special Education Data Base, Special Education Process Evaluation, and Project SEED (Structured Environment for the Emotionally Disturbed). Each section contains an executive summary with the major evaluation questions and responses; an abstract with information on project objectives, sample population, evaluation design, and results; and the 1978-79 plan, when appropriate. (SBH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

DALLAS INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRIC

ED175189

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

IN RETROSPECT 1977-78

SPECIAL EDUCATION RESEARCH

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

W.J. Webster

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EC120053

2

DEPARTMENT OF RESEARCH, EVALUATION AND INFORMATION SYSTEMS

IN RETROSPECT 1977-78

IN RETROSPECT IS A COMPOSITE OF THE SUMMARIES WRITTEN FOR EVERY SPECIAL EDUCATION RESEARCH AND EVALUATION PROJECT IN THE 1977-78 SCHOOL YEAR. EACH PROJECT INCLUDES:

1) EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:
   THE MAJOR EVALUATION QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES
2) ABSTRACT:
   A. OBJECTIVES
   B. SAMPLE
   C. EVALUATION DESIGN
   D. RESULTS
3) 1978-79 PLAN, WHEN APPROPRIATE

Dallas, Texas
January, 1979

LOOKING AT
THE DALLAS INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT

The Dallas Independent School District (DISD) is located in the Dallas metropolitan area which has a total population of about one million people. The DISD serves 140,000 students and employs over 14,000 people. The District operates 19 high schools, 22 middle schools, and 135 elementary schools in a geographic area of 351 square miles.

The DISD special education program serves about 10,000 students in one or more instructional arrangements ranging from hospital/homebound instruction to total regular classroom placement. Texas law currently provides special services for ages three through twenty-one, and birth through twenty-one for the deaf or blind. Selected exemplary programs and procedures have included a needs assessment based staff development program, the implementation of special centers for the severely handicapped child, and Project KIDS, a DISD early intervention project for the handicapped.

The DISD led the way during the 70s in establishing research and evaluation (R&E) in public school education. Special education management also saw this need and part of the DISD effort today includes eight R&E personnel, listed below, who work full-time on special education studies which have been represented in this document.

DISD RESEARCH, EVALUATION & INFORMATION SYSTEMS
SPECIAL EDUCATION COMPONENT STAFF

Jamie L. Carter
Deborah F. C. Gilliam
Donald E. Hawkins
Michael A. Holt
Jenci J. Kocsis
Daniel J. Macy
Karen Cortell Reisman
Alberta M. Rogers

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
YELLOW	INDIVIDUALIZED EDUCATIONAL PLANS	
	Executive Summary	2
	Abstract	4
BLUE	PROJECT HELP-SCREENING	
	Executive Summary	10
	Abstract	12
TAN	PROJECT KIDS	
	Executive Summary	17
	Abstract	20
	1978-79 Plan	30
	1978-79 Outreach Plan	36
GREEN	PROJECT KIDS THEORETICAL CONTROL STUDY	
	Executive Summary	44
	Abstract	46
	1978-79 Plan	50
GOLD	PROJECT ZERO REJECT - CHILD FIND	
	Executive Summary	55
	Abstract	58
	1978-79 Plan	67
PINK	SPECIAL EDUCATION DATA BASE	
	Executive Summary	72
	Abstract	74
	1978-79 Plan	78
ORANGE	SPECIAL EDUCATION PROCESS EVALUATION	
	Executive Summary	85
	Abstract	87
	1978-79 Plan	89
BUFF	PROJECT SEED*	
	1978-79 Plan	93

*Project initiated in the 1978-79 school year.

Dallas Independent School District
Dr. Nolan Estes, General Superintendent

Development Division
Mr. Rogers L. Barton
Associate Superintendent

Department of Research, Evaluation,
and Information Systems
Dr. William J. Webster
Deputy Associate Superintendent

EVALUATION OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF INDIVIDUALIZED EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

SP78-269-31-08

Alberta M. Rogers, M.Ed.
and
Daniel J. Macy, Ph.D.

Approved report of the Department of Research, Evaluation, and Information Systems

Daniel J. Macy, Ph.D.
Principal Evaluator
Special Education

Robert P. Grobe, Ph.D.
Principal Evaluator
Special Program Evaluation

William J. Webster, Ph.D.
Department Head

Dallas, Texas
August, 1978

Executive Summary

Evaluation of the Implementation
of Individualized Educational Programs

Evaluators: Alberta M. Rogers
Daniel J. Macy

Approved: Robert P. Hosler

Question 1: What were the staff development priorities identified by special education teachers? TWENTY-TWO PRIORITY COMPETENCY AREAS

A systems approach to staff development whereby staff worked through a systematic process of needs identification, prioritization and solution recommendation resulted in the identification of twenty-two priority competency areas. The Individualized Educational Program (IEP) was named by 40 percent of the special education staff as a priority competency area. All 22 areas are listed below:

- Adaptive Physical Education
- Assessment-Formal and Informal
- Affective Education
- Behavior Management
- Child Development
- Classroom Organization
- Counseling Techniques/ Crisis Intervention
- Communication-Public Relations
- Cultural Factors
- Special Problems
- Handicapping Conditions
- Individualized Educational Program
- Instructional Strategies
- Medically Related Problems
- Parent Involvement
- Personal Growth and Self-Awareness
- Pre-Vocational Career Education
- Pupil Personnel Committee, Admissions, Review and Dismissal
- Special Problems
- Teacher Aides
- Current Trends, Issues
- Utilization of Community and District Resources.

Question 2: What staff development activities were conducted? TWO DAYS PLANNED IN A CONFERENCE FORMAT WITH OPTIONS

Each staff development day was planned relative to identified needs and suggested solution activities. Participants selected sessions from an array of 60 or more alternatives including seven relating to the Individualized Educational Program.

Question 3: What improvement was made by special education teachers on identified competencies? PROGRESS NOTED

Time did not allow investigation of this question directly. Sub-district coordinators noted an improvement in developing IEPs, however, and 65 percent of the teachers indicated their identified needs had been met by the staff development conferences.

Question 4: Did the content of written IEP documents meet the guidelines of P.L. 94-142 as specified by the Texas Education Agency (TEA)? IN FIVE OF SEVEN AREAS

At this writing, TEA had not provided specific guidelines. Results are based on guidelines as determined from P.L. 94-142. Overall, the content of sampled IEP documents written by the special education staff met the guidelines except annual goals and objectives. Those written by speech pathologists complied with all guidelines.

Question 5: What was the technical quality of objectives demonstrated in written IEP documents? INCOMPLETE

Objectives written for special education students were technically complete in 33 percent of the IEPs. Those written for speech students were complete in 88 percent of the cases.

Question 6: How did the reading and math performance of selected Language Learning Delayed children on calibrated items relate to the completeness of written IEP documents? NOT RESOLVED

The calibrated items were not available at this writing.

Question 7: What needs or problems, if any, did teachers perceive in developing IEPs? ONE MAJOR NEED

A need for adequate materials for specified instructional goals and objectives was indicated by 40 percent of the teachers.

Question 8: What was the level of knowledge demonstrated by teachers about IEP guidelines as specified in P.L. 94-142 as specified by Texas Education Agency? MARGINAL

Less than one half of the teachers correctly answered at least 80 percent of the questions relating to Federal guidelines in P.L. 94-142.

Abstract

Evaluation of the Implementation of Individualized Educational Programs

Evaluators: Alberta M. Rogers
Daniel J. Macy

Objectives of the Program: Public Law 94-142 mandates that all children in Special Education shall have an Individualized Educational Program (IEP). The two basic components of the IEP consist of the administrative structure for development, implementation, and review and the written plan stating the Individualized Educational Program. The format of the written IEP document for the 1977-1978 school year differs from that used previously throughout the District. This revised IEP plan must include present levels of educational performance, annual goals, short-term objectives, extent of participation in a regular education program, and a description of all special education and related services to be provided. The aim of the Special Education program was to develop and implement IEPs which met the guidelines of Public Law 94-142.

Purpose of the Evaluation: The evaluation of the implementation of IEPs in the District's Special Education program was designed to assess the quality of the technical content of the written IEP document and to describe the operating procedures surrounding IEP development and implementation. In the absence of specific guidelines which were to have been provided by the Texas Education Agency (TEA), this assessment was based on guidelines as determined from P. L. 94-142. Results were expected to assist in determining the relationship of identified special education staff development needs, priorities and training outcomes to IEP development and implementation.

Sample: Samples for staff development data included all special education staff members who participated in the August, 1977 pre-school needs assessment activity and staff development throughout the year. Of the approximately 600 staff members who were participants, responses of 260 were obtained on the IEP Input Questionnaire and responses of 263 were obtained on the IEP Awareness Questionnaire during the November 23, 1977 staff development session. The samples for the Staff Development Training Questionnaire was composed of 585 participants at the November 23, 1977 staff development session and 484 at the March 3, 1978 session.

Random stratified-sampling techniques were used for the selection of the IEP survey sample. Fifty-four IEP plans were selected from those written for students with primary handicaps other than speech. Forty eight IEPs written for speech students were selected and treated separately.

Evaluation Design: The design used for the collection of data may be schematically represented as follows:

	Needs Assessment	Staff Development	Staff Development
Staff Development	X O_1	X O_2 O_3 O_4	X O_5
Survey of IEPs (R)		X O_6 O_7	

The treatment X refers to exposure to staff development activities. Observation O_1 is the Staff Development Worksheet; O_2 and O_3 are the IEP related questionnaires (Teacher Input and Teacher Awareness); O_4 and O_5 are the Staff Development Training Questionnaire; O_6 is the IEP Checklist; and O_7 is the Objectives Checklist.

The major evaluation questions were:

1. What were the staff development priorities identified by special education teachers?

2. What staff development activities were conducted?

3. What improvement was made by special education teachers on identified competencies?

4. Did the content of written IEP documents meet the guidelines of P.L. 94-142 as specified by the Texas Education Agency?

5. What was the technical quality of objectives demonstrated in written IEP documents?

6. How did the reading and math performance of selected Language Learning Delayed (LLD) children on calibrated items relate to the completeness of written IEP documents?

7. What needs or problems, if any, did teachers perceive in developing IEPs?

8. What was the level of knowledge demonstrated by teachers about IEP guidelines as specified in P.L. 94-142 as specified by Texas Education Agency?

Evaluation Results:

1. Dr. Ruth Turner was given the primary responsibility for the design and implementation of the 1977-78 special education staff development program. A systems approach to staff development was used whereby staff worked through a systematic process of needs identification, prioritization, and solution recommendation. Participants were asked to identify their priority training needs and suggest learning activities which would promote professional growth in these priority areas. Twenty-two priority competency areas were identified by special education staff. These were:

Adaptive Physical Education
Assessment-Formal and Informal
Affective Education
Behavior Management
Child Development
Classroom Organization
Counseling Techniques/
Crisis Intervention
Communication-Public Relations
Cultural Factors
Special Problems
Handicapping Conditions
Individualized Educational
Program
Instructional Strategies
Medically Related Problems
Parent Involvement
Personal Growth and Self-
Awareness
Pre-Vocational Career Education
Pupil Personnel Committee,
Admissions, Review and
Dismissal
Special Problems
Teacher Aides
Current Trends, Issues
Utilization of Community and
District Resources

The Individualized Educational Program was identified as a priority competency area by special education staff in the following instructional arrangements: (1) Home and Hospital Bound, (2) Resource Room, (3) Emotionally Disturbed, (4) Developmental Centers, and (5) Early Childhood. These groups represented about 40 percent of the special education staff attending the August staff development session.

2. Staff development program days were planned relative to identified needs and suggested solution activities. Each staff development day was planned in a format similar to a conference in which participants were able to select sessions from a large array of alternatives. Of the 65 alternative sessions offered during the November 23 staff development session, four related to the Individualized Educational Program. Three of the 60 alternative sessions offered during the March 3 staff development session related to the IEP. These sessions provided staff members the opportunity to participate in activities concerning familiarization with the elements of P.L. 94-142, task analysis, writing goals and objectives, working with diagnosticians and resource persons and steps in developing good IEPs.

   The participants rated the format, organization and content of the staff development conferences highly. The sessions relating to IEPs were rated good or very good by 82 percent of the November participants and 95 percent of the March participants. Overall, the conference format was rated positively by 88 percent of the November and 96 percent of the March participants.

3. Teachers reportedly made some improvement in developing IEPs as shown by reports of sub-district coordinators and the positive response of 85 percent of the fall and 87 percent of the spring participants who indicated their identified needs had been met by the staff development conferences. The deficiency reported by both teacher and coordinator was in naming dates for mastery of objectives.

4. Data obtained from the IEP Checklist indicated that, overall, written IEP documents met P.L. 94-142 guidelines. Deficiencies in a statement of annual goals and corresponding short term objectives were noted for more than half the documents written for special education students, however. Six documents written for speech students were incomplete due to deficiences in specifying baseline behavior.

5. Data which were collected with the Objectives Checklist indicated that objectives written for special education students were technically complete in 33 percent of the IEPs, while those written for speech students were technically complete in 88 percent of the IEPs. Of the four essential parts, the observational method was excluded in 42 percent of the objectives, the attainment date was excluded in 39 percent, the performance level was excluded in 28 percent and the observational task was excluded in 9 percent of the objectives. Objectives relating to math and language arts accounted for 61 percent of all objectives sampled.

6. Determination of the relationship between student achievement and the technical quality of written IEPs was not attempted. The resolution of this question involved two tasks: (1) the survey of District IEPs and (2) the development of two objective tests containing calibrated items in the context of the Rasch testing model. The survey of IEPs was conducted and a preliminary identification of an appropriate pool of items was completed in preparation for the development of the reading and math objective tests. The items selected were not available from the Oregon Tri-County Goal Development Project, however, within the time frame of the current study. Further investigation will likely be undertaken in future studies.

7. Data obtained from the responses to the Teacher IEP Input Questionnaire indicated that the majority of special education staff members perceived no problems in developing IEPs. These results are somewhat inconsistent with those of the IEP survey. While 93 percent of the teachers responding to the Input Questionnaire reported understanding the distinction between a long-term goal and short-term objectives, the January IEP survey revealed that only 42 percent of special education teachers specified long-term goals with short-term objectives on sampled IEP documents. Likewise, only 33 percent of teachers sampled in the January IEP survey wrote technically complete objectives, but 60 percent of teachers in the November staff development selected the technically complete objective as being most useful.

   The findings of the IEP survey showed a deficiency in specifying the attainment date for 39 percent of the objectives. Only 10 percent of the teachers indicated a perceived inability to project realistic dates for mastery of instructional objectives, which also was a deficiency noted by sub-district coordinators. A need

for adequate materials was noted by 40 percent of the teachers. Parental involvement in developing IEPs was limited to passive acceptance according to 68 percent of the teachers. Parental involvement was not perceived as valuable assistance in developing IEPs by 10 percent of the teachers.

8. When asked to respond to eight questions about Federal guidelines in P. L. 94-142, less than one-half the teachers responded correctly to at least 80 percent of the questions. Correct responses to 80 percent of the questions were made by almost 70 percent of the support personnel while 10 percent of the teacher's aides attained the same criterion. Of all the areas investigated, teacher's exhibited the least amount of knowledge concerning parent involvement and time constraints for developing and reviewing the IEP. Only 11 percent could name the three ways in which parents must be involved in their child's special education program. Approximately 50 percent were unable to state the appropriate time limits for development and revision of IEPs. These results were mixed as they related to teachers' reported knowledge of District policies and procedures and teachers' observed knowledge. While 55 percent of the teachers in the November 23 data collection reported knowledge of the District policies and procedures, 56 percent responded correctly to questions concerning time requirements for development and review of IEPs, and 11 percent responded correctly to a question concerning parents' involvement in the IEP development process. The correct interval for IEP revision by an ARD committee was indicated by 48 percent of the teachers.

Dallas Independent School District
Dr. Nolan Estes, General Superintendent

Development Division
Mr. Rogers L. Barton
Associate Superintendent

Department of Research, Evaluation,
and Information Systems
Dr. William J. Webster
Deputy Associate Superintendent

PROJECT HELP
DATA ASSESSMENT

SE78-103-3-8

Jenci J. Kocsis, M.S.

Daniel J. Macy, Ph.D.

Approved report of the Department of Research
Evaluation, and Information Systems

Daniel J. Macy

Daniel J. Macy, Ph.D.
Principal Evaluator
Special Education

William T. Denton

William T. Denton, Ph.D.
Director-Developmental
Project Evaluation

William J. Webster, Ph.D.
Department Head

11

Dallas, Texas
February, 1978

Executive Summary

Evaluation of Project HELP
Data Assessment

Evaluators: Jenci J. Kocsis
Daniel J. Macy

Approved: _____

_____

Question 1: What is the incidence of students flagged high-risk who received special educational services?

Results of the screening indicate that a relatively small percentage of students who were flagged high-risk during the three years of Project HELP received special educational services following the screenings.

What type of services were offered to these students by special education?

Most of the high-risk students who were enrolled in special education have a speech problem as a primary handicap. This was due to the fact that the HELP - speech screening was used by speech clinicians to make the following year's enrollment in special education.

Question 2: To what extent did the Metropolitan Readiness Test (MRT) scores predict enrollment in special education?

The correlation between the pre-reading percentile score of the MRT and student enrollment in special education was .55. These scores should be considered in the future for flagging potentially high-risk students on the K-1 level, since this was the highest correlation obtained from all the screening data.

Question 3: How do the attendance records of a sample of high-risk students compare to those of a sample of non-high-risk students?

The attendance study indicates that there was no difference in the number of days attended by the high-risk and control students over a three year period.

Question 4: To what extent did the Parent and Teacher Checklists predict student enrollment in special education?

On the Parent and Teacher Checklist of Development correlations across items ranged from r = .03 to r = .60, but was considered less effective in predicting students being enrolled in special education than the MRT.

Question 5: How do the System-Wide test scores of the high-risk students compare to those of the non-high risk student?

In comparing a sample of high-risk and control students' Iowa Test of Basic Skills Reading and Math subtests, it was found that there was no difference between the two groups on either of the subtests.

Abstract

Project HELP Data Assessment

Evaluators: Jenci J. Kocsis
Daniel J. Macy

Objectives of the Project: For the past three school years, Project HELP has been involved in screening the District's kindergarten and first grade (K-1) population for potential learning problems. More specifically, the screening was directed at academic, behavioral, health and speech problems in the school setting. Once these data were collected by the teachers, nurses, and speech clinicians, they were translated into computer usable form and merged to produce a data base file for each year. The evaluation of Project HELP data assessment - a longitudinal followup - focused on providing decision-makers with information relative to the effectiveness of the last three years of the K-1 screening. Comparisons of computer files were made to determine what type of services were rendered to those students who were flagged as potentially high-risk. This involved a computer search of the Special Education data base in order to find those students.

Analysis of Metropolitan Readiness Test (MRT) scores along with scores from a Parent and Teacher Checklist of Development was performed to determine the predictive power of the MRT relative to special education membership.

Attendance records of a sample of high-risk and control students were compared in term of percent maximum possible attendance over a three year period.

Finally, scores from the System-Wide Testing were compared for a sample of high-risk and control groups.

Sample: The sample for the study consisted of the three years of HELP data as compared to a control sample and the three years of the Special Education enrollment data.

The 1974-75 HELP sample consisted of 7826 high-risk students and 7855 control students; the 1975-76 sample consisted of 5359 high-risk, and 5461 control students. The 1976-77 sample consisted of 8204 high-risk and 12,872 control children.

Evaluation Design: A number of selected observations was made for the overall analysis of this study.

The specific observations might be thought of as:

$$O_1 \ldots\ldots O_c$$

O_1 = High-rish samples

O_2 = Control samples

O_3 = Special education membership samples

O_4 = Non-special education membership samples

O_5 = Parent checklist sample

O_6 = Teacher checklist sample

O_7 = Met opolitan Readiness Test samples

O_8 = Iowa Test of Basic Skills samples

The study investigated the following evaluation questions.

1. What is the incidence of students flagged high-risk who received special educational services?

   What type of services were offered to these students by special education?

2. To what extent did the Metropolitan Readiness Test (MRT) scores predict encrollment in special education?

3. How do the attendance records of a sample of high-risk students compare to those of a sample of non-high-risk students?

4. To what extent did the Parent and Teacher Checklists predict student enrollment in special education?

5. How do the System-Wide test scores of the high-risk students compare to those of the non-high-risk students?

Evaluation Results: A brief summary of the major findings of the Project HELP data assessment study is given below.

1. The following table represents a summary of the percent of students who were served by special education following the Project HELP screenings.

	% High Risk (N=7100)		% Control (N=8700)	
	Including Speech	No Speech	Including Speech	No Speech
1974-75	17.6	4.9	6.2	1.4
1975-76	18.9	5.6	2.8	0.9
1976-77	10.3	3.2	0.8	0.2

2. Speech handicap represented the majority of the high-risk enrollment because the screening information provided by HELP was used for the following year's speech enrollment in special education.

3. Results of the membership study show that, except for the speech screening, the Project HELP screening data did not greatly differ from control data in terms of special education enrollment.

4. The pre-reading percentile Metropolitan Readiness Test score yielded a point-biserial correlation coefficient of .55 in predicting students being enrolled in special education.

5. The median MRT score for the special education students was the 16th percentile, while the median for the control sample was the 61st percentile.

6. The attendance records of a sample of high-risk students as compared to a sample of control students was the same over a three year period.

7. On the Parent and Teacher Checklist of Development correlations across items ranged from r = .03 to r = .60, but was considered less effective in predicting students being enrolled in special education than the MRT.

8. When students' Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS) reading and math scores were compared in a sample of high-risk and control, analysis revealed that there was no difference between the two group's scores.

9. The results of the study on a whole indicate that the MRT pre-reading percentile score be considered as an instrument in flagging potentially high-risk students on the K-1 level.

Additional Information: Refer to the following report for more information on the Project HELP Data Assessment study.

NUMBER	AUTHOR	TITLE
SE78-103-8-8	Jenci J. Kocsis	Project HELP Data Assessment.

Dallas Independent School District
Dr. Nolan Estes, General Superintendent

Development Division
Mr. Rogers L. Barton
Associate Superintendent

Department of Research, Evaluation,
and Information Systems
Dr. William J. Webster
Deputy Associate Superintendent

EVALUATION OF PROJECT KIDS
(KINDLING INDIVIDUAL DEVELOPMENT SYSTEMS)

SP78-105-31-08

Jamie L. Carter, M.A.
and
Daniel J. Macy, Ph.D.

Approved report of the Department of Research,
Evaluation, and Information Systems

Daniel J. Macy, Ph.D.
Principal Evaluator
Special Education

Robert P. Grobe, Ph.D.
Principal Evaluator
Special Program Evaluation

William J. Webster, Ph.D.
Department Head

Dallas, Texas
September, 1978

Executive Summary

Evaluation of Project KIDS
(Kindling Individual Development Systems)

Evaluators: Jamie L. Carter
Daniel J. Macy

Approved: Robert P. Hobe

Question 1: How many children were served in Project KIDS?

128 (36 home-based, 22 center-based, 70 school-based)

Question 2: What demographic characteristics described the population of children and their parents?

Children: 63 percent male, 28 percent Anglo, 56 percent Black, 15 percent Mexican-American and one percent other. Age range was one month to five years. Predominant handicaps were due to developmental delay, cerebral palsy and varied abnormalities.

Parents: Educational level ranged from elementary school to college graduates. About 50 percent of the families owned their homes which ranged in estimated value from $5,000 to $350,000.

Question 3: What was the observed improvement, if any, in the areas of developmental delay?

Project KIDS students made significant improvement ($p \leq .01$) in the areas of delay as measured by pre-post scores on a developmental scale and two standardized tests.

Developmental scale scores, as determined by the number of tasks successfully completed by the students on the KIDS Inventory of Development, increased significantly in all four areas of the inventory: gross motor, fine motor, cognitive/language, and self-help. Average gains of younger children (ages 0-2 years) during the 12-month interval were 8.7 months (mental scale) and 7.5 months (motor scale) on the Bayley Scales of Infant Development. Of the school-based children (ages 3-5 years) who scored within the norms on the McCarthy Scales of Children's Abilities

the average gain was 14.3 months during an eight-month interval.

Question 4: To what extent was observed improvement due to intervention through Project KIDS?

Detailed findings related to this question are presented in the accompanying Abstract (No. SP78-110-31-08).

Question 5: What were the needs reported by parents in a self-appraisal inventory?

Ability to plan and implement learning activities appropriate to the developmental age of the child.

Knowledge and recognition of normal developmental milestones.

Ability to give firm and consistent discipline to the child.

Understand the disability and special needs resulting from the handicap.

Question 6: What was the extent of agreement between parenting needs reported by parents on a self-appraisal inventory and parenting needs of parents as seen by project staff?

As compared to teachers' ratings of the parent competence levels, the parents rated themselves significantly ($p \leq .05$) stronger in selected competency areas. Correlation coefficients between parents and teachers were low, .27 and .14. Although parents and teachers disagreed about the relative level of parent competency, they did agree on specific strengths and needs.

Question 7: What progress was made in meeting identified needs of parents?

There was no significant difference between parents' scores on the pretest and parents' scores on the posttest. However, parents responded on a reaction questionnaire that the individualized parent training programs were effective in increasing their knowledges and skills in the competency areas.

Question 8: What was the reaction of parents to the project?

Results of the parent reaction survey indicated that parents held highly favorable attitudes toward the Project KIDS program, especially in the areas of staff qualifications, student progress and parent training/ involvement program.

Question 9: What were the staff competencies identified by project staff and what was the observed improvement in staff competencies?

A list of 28 competencies was identified and incorporated into a staff self-assessment instrument. Competencies involved such areas as instructional techniques, assessment procedures, medical aspects of handicaps, community resources and parent interaction.

On a self-assessment instrument, pre-post test scores showed significant improvement.

Question 10: What was the reaction of project staff to staff development activities?

There was a strong positive staff reaction to staff development activities.

Question 11: What were the demonstration/dissemination activities of the project?

Five dissemination packages were developed in the areas of appraisal, curriculum, staff development, parent involvement and evaluation. A total of 242 dissemination packages was sold (at cost) to agencies and personnel in 23 states, Canada, and Puerto Rico. Other activities included site visits and presentations at professional conferences.

Abstract

Evaluation of Project KIDS
(Kindling Individual Development Systems)

Evaluators: Jamie L. Carter
Daniel J. Macy

Objectives of the Project: Project KIDS (Kindling Individual Development Systems) is a Dallas Independent School District model program for handicapped infants, toddlers, preschool children and their families. The program, which is financially supported by the Bureau for the Education of the Handicapped in the U. S. Office of Education, is part of a nationwide network of early childhood projects for the handicapped. The project serves developmentally delayed and physically handicapped children from 0-60 months of age, with services delivered through three methods: a home-based training program, center-based infant stimulation classes, and school-based early childhood class units. Project KIDS attempts to integrate the child's parents into the instructional role in cooperation with project staff. The administration and organization of the project is built around four components: children, parents, staff development, and demonstration/dissemination.

The major objectives are:

1. to improve development or function of children in the identified area or areas of delay.

2. to provide a continuum of education from a home setting to a school setting for handicapped children and their parents.

3. to deliver instructional service through the cooperative efforts of project staff and parents through home visits, infant stimulation classes, or public school early childhood classes.

4. to develop and utilize a parent self-appraisal inventory as a means of identifying parent needs in the area of parenting handicapped children in terms of the cognitive and affective domains.

5. to develop and implement cooperative plans for individual parent training activities as the primary vehicle for improving needs identified in the self-appraisal inventory.

6. to develop and utilize a staff survey instrument as baseline curriculum document where competencies and skills are interfaced with survey items.

7. to develop and distribute information packages on key dissemination products and to conduct demonstration activities.

Purpose of the Evaluation: The evaluation sought to provide a comprehensive study of project implementation and effectiveness. As such, the evaluation specified process and product evaluation questions within the components of the project.

Sample: The samples selected for data collection included 80 to 100 percent of the respective populations. The numbers of children served in the three instructional arrangements were:

	Population size
Home-based	33
Center-based	22
School-based (early childhood)	70
Total	128

The instructional staff sample included 11 teachers, two teacher aides and one home liaison.

Evaluation Design: The study was primarily cross-sectional, but did include pre-post observations for children, parents and staff. The following schematics give the design of the study for each major group observed. In the schematics, X represents the application of a treatment (i.e., home-based instruction, parent training, etc.), and 0 represents observations (i.e., data collection).

Children $\underline{0}_1 - \underline{X} - \underline{0}_2$ (N=62, developmental progress)

The above schematic shows that there were pre-post observations for 62 children on the developmental measures (Bayley Scales, McCarthy Scales and KIDS Inventory of Development).

Parents $- - \underline{X} - \underline{0}_1$ (N=83, project reaction)

$\underline{X} - \underline{0}_1 - \underline{X}$ (N=31, competency prioritization)

$\underline{0}_1 - \underline{X} - \underline{0}_2 \; \underline{0}_3$ (0_2: N=11, teacher ratings
0_3: N=75, parent self-assessment)

The above schematic describes three types of designs utilized in the parent component. Project reaction data were collected near the end of the school year, while the competency prioritization study was conducted near mid-year. Parent self-assessment measures were administered on a pre-post schedule, with teacher ratings collected at posttesting.

Staff	$O_1 _ X _ O_2$	(N=14, staff development measure)
	$_ _ X _ O_1$	(N=12, staff reaction)

As outlined in the above schematic, the staff development measure was administered on a pre-post schedule, and staff reaction data were collected at posttesting.

Other data regarding project operation were collected from project records as needed throughout the year.

The evaluation sought to answer the following major questions:

Student and Parent Demography

1. How many children were served in Project KIDS?
2. What demographic characteristics described the population of children and their parents?

Student Progress

3. What was the observed improvement, if any, in the areas of developmental delay?
4. To what extent was observed improvement due to intervention through Project KIDS?

Parent Competency Needs Assessment and Parent Needs

5. What were the needs reported by parents in a self-appraisal inventory?
6. What was the extent of agreement between parenting needs reported by parents on a self-appraisal inventory and parenting needs of parents as seen by project staff?
7. What progress was made in meeting identified needs of parents?

Parent Reactions

8. What was the reaction of parents to the project?

Staff Development

9. What were the staff competencies identified by project staff and what was the observed improvement in staff competencies?
10. What was the reaction of project staff to staff development activities?

Demonstration/Dissemination

11. What were the demonstration/dissemination activities of the project?

Evaluation Results:

Student and Parent Demography

1. Project KIDS provided instructional services to 128 handicapped infants and preschool children during its third year of operation (1977-78). This was an increase of 35 over the previous year.

2. By instructional setting, 36 children received instruction in their homes; 22 students attended center-based infant stimulation classes, and 70 students attended eight school-based early childhood classes in five DISD schools.

3. By sex, 81 (63.3 percent) of the children were males, and 47 (36.7 percent) were females.

4. According to ethnicity, the largest proportion of children served was Black, and this pattern was consistent across all instructional settings. The ethnic composition of Project KIDS was: 72 (56.3 percent) Black; 36 (28.1 percent) Anglo; 19 (14.8 percent) Mexican-American; and one (0.8 percent) other.

5. Project KIDS served children zero through five years of age. The frequencies of children by age were: five children under one year of age; 19 one-year-old children; 32 two-year-old children; 21 three-year-old children; 27 four-year-old children; and 24 five-year-old children.

6. Not accounting for the overlap of continuing students, Project KIDS served 234 children during its three years of operation. When considering the students who were served for more than one year, 173 students were served in Project KIDS.

7. All but 12 children were still actively enrolled in the program at the end of the school year. Of these 12, two children were dismissed from the program after progressing to a level consistent with their chronological age.

8. In conjunction with the objective of providing a continuum of education for handicapped children from the home to the public school setting, six children were served in the school setting after a promotion from the center-based program. One of these children had been served in all three settings. Eighteen of the younger children were scheduled to be promoted to the school-based program for the 1978-79 school year.

9. Project KIDS served a heterogeneous group of students by handicapping condition. In the home and center-based programs, most of the children were multiply handicapped with the primary handicapping conditions most often diagnosed as developmental delay, cerebral palsy and Down's Snydrome. The most frequent primary handicapping conditions in the school-based program were minimal brain injured, educable mentally retarded and learning/language disabled.

10. In the home and center-based programs, a majority of the children (N=35) was living with both parents.

11. The parents involved in home and center-based programs represented a wide range in socioeconomic characteristics. About 50 percent of the families owned their homes which ranged in estimated value from $5,000 to $350,000. The median value of the homes was about $20,000. Most of the parents had graduated from high school and a few had received college degrees. By occupation, the highest percentage of parents were employed in typically "blue collar" occupations.

Student Progress

12. Project KIDS students made significant improvement in the areas of developmental delay during the 1977-78 year as measured by a developmental scale and two standardized tests.

13. Significant gains were made by the children (N=62) from pretest to posttest on the KIDS Inventory of Development Scale, a developmental checklist developed by the Project KIDS staff. Scores, as determined by the number of developmental tasks successfully completed by the students, increased significantly in all four areas of the inventory: gross motor, fine motor, cognitive/language, and self-help.

14. A preliminary validity study of the KIDS Inventory indicated that the instrument was seemingly appropriate for the population. The study found fairly high validity coefficients for the KIDS Inventory when this was correlated with the Bayley Scales of Infant Development and the McCarthy Scales of Children's Abilities.

15. For the younger children in the home and center-based programs (ages 0-30 months), raw scores on the Bayley Scales significantly increased from the pretest to posttest (12-month interval). With the use of repeated-measures analysis of variance, the results were significant at the .01 level. The average gain in months was 8.67 on the Mental Scale and 7.53 on the Motor Scale.

16. For children in the school-based early childhood classes, raw scores on the McCarthy Scales significantly increased from pretest to posttest (eight-month interval). With the use of repeated-measures analysis of variance, the results were significant at the .01 level, for the general cognitive scores and the motor scores.

17. When the McCarthy scores were transformed to scale scores, 18 of the 37 scores (48.6 percent) fell below the norms, indicating the severity of handicapping conditions. Based on a normal population, only one-tenth of one percent of all students taking the McCarthy would be expected to score below the norms. The scores of these 18 students were over three standard deviations below the mean.

18. Of the 19 students scoring within the norms, four children made sufficient gains to place their scores at or near a level appropriate to their chronological age. These 19 students made an average of 14.32 months gain during the eight month interval.

19. On both the Bayley and McCarthy Scales, more improvement was seen in the cognitive/mental areas than in the motor areas.

20. The statistical phenomenon of "regression to the mean" was considered in the analysis of data since Project KIDS served a population exhibiting extreme low scores due to developmental delays. To control for "regression to the mean," pretest scores were transformed to predicted or "regressed" scores through a weighting process which, in this case, increased the pretest scores. These procedures decreased the likelihood of statistically significant results. Even after controlling for "regression to the mean," the results were still statistically significant, thus allowing for increased confidence in the results of the analysis.

Parent Competency Needs Assessment

21. A list of 69 competencies pertinent to the parenting of young handicapped children was identified through a needs assessment procedure. The list was submitted to groups of parents and professionals for prioritization through a process of rank ordering from most important to least important. Overall, the parents tended to place similar priorities on the competencies as did the professionals, with Spearman's rho correlation coefficients ranging from .69 to .77. Interrelationships between the rankings of the three professional groups (visiting teachers, educational diagnosticians and psychologists) were even higher with correlation coefficients ranging from .82 to .86.

22. According to agreement across all four sampled groups, the top and low priority competencies were:

Top Priority	Low Priority
Accepts the child as a unique and valuable individual	Handles money and finances in a responsible way.
Understands and accepts the child's disability.	Shares ideas and information with other parents.
Understands and accepts own feelings about the child and the handicap.	Makes plans for the future of the child.
	Reads to the child.

Top Priority	Low Priority
Builds the child's self-concept.	Provides or makes suitable play materials, activities or toys.
Shows affection to the child through touching or physical contact.	Provides learning activities outside the home.
Listens to the child.	Matches learning activities, materials and toys to the child's level of development.
Gives the child a stable home life.	

23. Although there was overall agreement between parents and professionals, there were certain individual competencies where the groups displayed little or no agreement. Parents placed much less emphasis than did professionals on the following competencies: understanding and considering own personal needs; seeing own personal goodness; and cooperating with spouse in raising the child. In contrast, parents placed much more emphasis than did professionals on the following competencies: finding help or special services for the child's handicap; using methods to stimulate the child's development; and keeping the child neat and clean.

24. Each competency was classified with one of six competency areas: child care-physical, child care-emotional, child management, instruction, family impact and personal skills. Overall, both parents and professionals gave the highest priority to competencies concerning the emotional care of the child. Parents and professionals also showed agreement in the areas of instruction, where a large proportion of competencies were ranked in the moderate to low priority levels, and personal skills, where the proportions of competencies were about equally distributed across the priority levels. Parents placed more emphasis than did the professionals on the physical care of the child, whereas, the professionals placed more emphasis than did the parents on the competencies concerning child management. Although all groups tended to give low priority to the family impact competencies, the parents placed even less emphasis on this area by ranking all but one of the family impact competencies in the low priority level.

Parent Needs

25. As a result of the needs assessment, top-ranked parental competencies were listed as items on the Parent Self-Appraisal Inventory. Parent ratings were then utilized to design individualized training programs for the parents.

26. At posttesting, parent self-assessments and teacher perceptions placed the overall parent competence level at average or above for those areas investigated in the study. Parent self-ratings were significantly stronger than the teacher ratings of parental competence ($p \leq .05$).

27. There was no significant difference between parents' scores on the pretest and parents' scores on the posttest. However, on a parent reaction questionnaire, parents responded that the parent training program was effective in that it increased their expertise in the competence areas. There was conjuecture that parents were overly confident in their pretest ratings, but more realistic in their posttest ratings after their involvement in the parent training program.

28. Across the different competency areas, the amount of agreement between parents and teachers showed considerable variation, and the correlation between the responses of parents and teachers showed a low relationship ($r = .27$ and $.14$).

29. Although parents and teachers disagreed about the relative level of parent competency, they did agree on specific strengths and needs.

30. Parents and teachers identified the parents' needs in the areas of being able to plan and implement learning activities appropriate to the developmental age of the child; knowing and recognizing normal developmental milestones; giving firm and consistent discipline to the child; and understanding the disability and special needs resulting from the handicap.

31. Parents and teachers identified the parents' strengths in the areas of loving the child and letting the child know he is loved; and taking an active role in planning and caring for the child.

32. No important differences were noted between the parents of the younger children (0-3 years) and parents of the older children (3-6 years).

33. There were difficulties in comparing last year's study with the results in the current study, since methodology differed and the instrument was substantially modified. However, two points of comparison were made. In both studies, the parents rated themselves significantly stronger in their competence than did the teachers' ratings of the parents. Also, although no important age related differences were noted in the current study, results in last year's study indicated a few age related differences.

Parent Reactions

34. Results of the parent reaction survey indicated that parents held highly favorable attitudes toward the Project KIDS program.

35. Parents emphasized the qualifications of the Project KIDS staff. In both the scaled and open-ended questions, parents expressed confidence in the expertise and attitudes of the staff.

36. Parents felt that their children had made progress while in the Project KIDS program.

37. Parents said they were "happy" with the program and wanted to continue their involvement.

38. Parents felt that the program had helped them to better understand their children's abilities and needs and had helped them to learn more about working with their children.

39. Comparison of questionnaire responses for the home and center-based parents for the current year (1977-78) and the previous year (1976-77) revealed no differences of consequence.

Staff Development

40. A list of 28 competencies was identified and incorporated into a staff self-assessment instrument. Results of teacher responses were used to plan staff development activities.

41. In the self-assessment of these competencies, teachers identified their strengths in areas involving instructional aspects, including informal assessment, intervention programs, classroom scheduling and utilization of support personnel.

42. The self-reported needs, which were stressed in staff development activities, included areas concerned with medically oriented aspects of the children, community resources for handicapped children and counseling techniques used at various stages of parental adjustment.

43. Overall, the teachers' self-ratings indicated a competence level ranging from "adequate" to "highly competent."

44. Project KIDS instructional staff members significantly increased their self-assessed level of competence during the 1977-78 school year.

45. According to their self-ratings, teachers showed increased confidence in nearly all investigated areas, especially in the areas of community resources available to handicapped children and the content and impact of Public Law 94-142.

46. Through their responses to an anonymous reaction questionnaire, staff members exhibited a highly favorable opinion of the staff development program.

47. The results of this study were consistent with results from last year's study in that the Project KIDS staff development program was effective in accomplishing the objectives of identifying staff competencies pertinent to the program; structuring activities to address these competency areas; and obtaining a measured improvement in staff competencies.

Demonstration/Dissemination

48. Five dissemination packages were developed in the areas of appraisal, curriculum, staff development, parent involvement and evaluation.

49. Project KIDS sold (at cost) 242 dissemination packages, with orders representing 23 states, Canada and Puerto Rico.

50. Visits to the project were made by 27 groups or individuals.

51. Project KIDS served as the internship site for 19 graduate students from area universitites.

52. Project KIDS staff presented papers on components of the program at 28 conferences.

1978-79 PLAN

PROJECT: Evaluation of Project KIDS (Kindling Individual Development Systems)

Evaluators: Jamie L. Carter and Daniel J. Macy

1.0 Description and Purpose

Project KIDS (Kindling Individual Development Systems) is a DISD model program for handicapped infants, toddlers, preschool children and their families. The program, which is financially supported by the Bureau for the Education of the Handicapped in the U.S. Office of Education, is part of a nationwide network of early childhood projects for the handicapped. The project serves developmentally delayed and physically handicapped children from 0-60 months of age, with services delivered through three methods: a home-based training program, center-based infant stimulation classes, and school-based early childhood class units. Project KIDS attempts to integrate the child's parents into the instructional role in cooperation with project staff. The administration and organization of the project is built around five components: children, parents, staff development, demonstration/dissemination, and evaluation.

The evaluation, which is a major component of Project KIDS, is concentrated in three general areas: the identification of information needs as these relate to questions of project development, refinement and effectiveness; the implementation of an overall evaluation design in terms of context, input, process and product evaluation; and the on-going communication of evaluation outcomes both formally and informally in accordance with project needs. In more specific terms the evaluation will include the identification of parent needs according to certain priorities; a survey of parent reactions to the project; observations in both the homes and classrooms; assessment of student progress and staff development effectiveness; and monitoring of demonstration/dissemination activities.

2.0 Major Evaluation Questions

2.1 Who received services through Project KIDS?

2.1.1 How many children were served in Project KIDS?

2.1.2 What demographic characteristics described the population of children and their parents?

2.2 What was the observed improvement, if any, in the areas of developmental delay?

2.2.1 To what extent was the videotaping program utilized in the evaluation and documentation of student progress?

2.2.2 What was the observed improvement, if any, as measured by standardized testing and developmental scale testing?

2.3 What were the needs reported by parents in a self-appraisal inventory?

2.4 What preferences did parents exhibit in selecting activities for their individualized training programs?

2.5 What progress was made in meeting identified needs of parents?

2.6 What was the reaction of parents to the project?

3.0 Instrumentation

3.1 Demographic data collection form, adaptable to a computerized data file (to be designed).

3.2 Bayley Scales of Infant Development.

3.3 McCarthy Scales of Children's Abilities.

3.4 KIDS Inventory of Development Scale.

3.5 Videotaping protocol form (to be designed).

3.6 KIDS Parent Self-Appraisal Inventory (to be designed).

3.7 Parent Reaction Questionnaire.

3.8 Demonstration/dissemination data collection form.

4.0 Design Groups

4.1 Student Population

Treatment	Test	School	Grade	No. Elements
Project KIDS	1,2,3,4,5	Home-Based Program	Ages 0 - 1	Approx. 30
		Center-based Program	Age 2 years	Approx. 25
		Casa View	EC	Approx. 11
		E. L. DeGolyer	EC	Approx. 6
		C. Oliver	EC	Approx. 16
		E. M. Pease	EC	Approx. 14
		Stevens Park	EC	Approx. 8
		H. C. Withers	EC	Approx. 9

4.2 Parent Population

Treatment	Test	School	No. Elements
Parent Training	6,7	Home-Based Program	Approx. 30
		Center-Based Program	Approx. 25
		Casa View	Approx. 11
		E. L. DeGolyer	Approx. 6
		C. Oliver	Approx. 16
		E. M. Pease	Approx. 14
		Stevens Park	Approx. 8
		H. C. Withers	Approx. 9

4.3 Teacher Population

Treatment	Test	School	No. Elements
Staff Development	8	Home-Based Program	1
		Center-Based Program	2
		Casa View	1
		E. L. DeGolyer	1
		C. Oliver	2
		E. M. Pease	2
		Stevens Park	1
		H. C. Withers	1

5.0 Data Collection

September 1 - 29	Administration of KIDS Inventory of Development
October 2 - 31	Administration of McCarthy Scales pretest
November 6 - 24	Administration of PSAI pretest
November 15 - 17	Demographic data collection
May 1 - 18	Administration of McCarthy Scales posttest
May 1 - 18	Administration of KIDS Inventory of Development
May 7 - 25	Administration of PSAI posttest
May 7 - 25	Administration of Parent Reaction Questionnaire
May 16 - 18	Demographic data collection

6.0 Data Analysis

Question 2.1	Frequencies of students: tabulation of the total number of students served in the project from July 1, 1978 through June 30, 1979, with subtotals defining the numbers of students by active or inactive status; location; and instructional setting: home, center or school. Characteristics of children and parents: tabulation of data from Project KIDS files and Special Education Computerized Data Base on age, sex, ethnicity, handicapping condition and general socioeconomic information.
Question 2.2	Videotaping: tabulation of type and use of videotapes, with data used for student progress evaluation, contingent on program's implementation. For each testing procedure: repeated-measures analysis of variance on a pre-post basis. Unit of analysis: individual students' scores.
Question 2.3	Listing of needs according to responses on the PSAI.
Question 2.4	Tabulations and descriptions of activities chosen by parents and placed in rank order by preference.
Question 2.5	Comparison of pre-post data with repeated ANOVA.
Question 2.6	Tabulations and descriptions of responses on the Parent Reaction Questionnaire.

7.0 Critical Events with Dates

7.1 Information needs determined, September 18, 1978

7.2 Revise Parent Self-Appraisal Inventory (PSAI), September 20, 1978

7.3 Pretest KIDS Inventory administered, September 29, 1978

7.4 Pretest McCarthy Scales administered, October 31, 1978

7.5 Posttest testing data collected, May 18, 1979

7.6 Posttest PSAI administered, May 25, 1979

7.7 Data file constructed, May 29, 1979

7.8 Demographic report, June 25, 1979

7.9 Parent component report, July 16, 1979

7.10 Student progress report, July 31, 1979

7.11 Abstract completed, August 6, 1979

7.12 Executive summary completed, August 8, 1979

7.13 Presentation of findings to project management, August 10, 1979

7.14 Reports ready for dissemination, August 13, 1979

8.0 Resources Commitments

8.1 Personnel

Name	Position	Days Committed
Daniel J. Macy	Principal Evaluator	30
Jamie L. Carter	Assistant Evaluator	134
Deborah F. C. Gilliam	Assistant Evaluator	65
Tommie Brown	Secretary	30
Debra J. Coleman	Data Technician	10
Temporary Workers	- - - -	5

8.2 Special Supplies

Not applicable

Report Distribution

A. Interim Reports

Review	Distribution
Robert P. Grobe	Ruth Turner
	Allen Sullivan
	Ruth Wilson
	Carlton Moffett
	B. J. Stamps
	Charles Jones
	Fannie McClure
	Ruby Morris
	William. J. Webster

B. Final Report

Review

Robert P. Grobe
William J. Webster

Distribution before presentation to the Board Evaluation Committee

Ruth Turner
Allen Sullivan
Ruth Wilson
Carlton Moffett
B. J. Stamps
Charles Jones
Fannie McClure
Ruby Morris
William J. Webster

Distribution after presentation to the Board Evaluation Committee

Otto Fridia
Special Education directors, facilitators and coordinators
Project KIDS staff
Principals:

Alexander	Hexter
Carver	Ireland
Casa View	Kramer
Cowart	Lee
DeGolyer	Macon
Hall	Milam
Oliver	Titche
Peabody	Thompson
Pease	Wheatley
Rice	Withers
Stevens Park	

I have read this plan and understand the nature of the information to be provided.

_____
Ruth Turner
Project KIDS Director
Director - Special Education

_____
Allen Sullivan
Deputy Associate Superintendent
Special Education

1978-79 PLAN

PROJECT: Evaluation of the 1978-79 Project KIDS Outreach (Kindling Individual Development Systems)

Evaluators: Deborah F. C. Gilliam and Daniel J. Macy

1.0 Description and Purpose

Project KIDS Outreach is a first-year program designed to increase the number of quality programs for young handicapped children through replication of the Project KIDS model training activities, demonstration and dissemination activities. Project KIDS is a DISD model program for handicapped infants, toddlers, preschool children and their families. The program, which is financially supported by the Bureau for the Education of the Handicapped in the U. S. Office of Education, is part of a nationwide network of early childhood projects for the handicapped. The three potential service delivery program settings include a home-based training program for infants (6 - 20 months), a center-based training program for toddlers (20 - 36 months) and a school based early childhood program for pre-schoolers (36 - 60 months). The KIDS Outreach component will concentrate its service delivery efforts on the school-based early childhood population (3 - 5 year olds). The support systems provided to each setting include an appraisal/curriculum component, staff development, parent involvement and a program evaluation component.

The objectives of the project apply to a local and regional level. At the local level, the project provides for the replication of all or a portion of the Project KIDS program components in 16 additional sites in the DISD. At the regional level, all or a portion of the Project KIDS program components will be replicated in a minimum of three additional sites in the area served by the Educational Service Center, Region X. Project staff will seek to provide each Outreach site the technical assistance needed in each component area of replication. In addition, the project will conduct demonstration and information sharing activities to increase public awareness of the KIDS program model and of the importance of early intervention. State level activities will include participation in the Triple T Consortium (Teaching Texas Tots), a statewide organization for projects who serve handicapped infants.

2.0 Major Evaluation Questions

2.1 What characteristics describe the replication sites?

2.2 Which components of the KIDS program did the Outreach sites select for replication?

2.2.1 To what extent were the program components of Project KIDS replicated?

2.3 What demographic characteristics described the students served in the program?

2.4 What was the instructional history of the Outreach students?

2.5 How did the Outreach site participants view the technical assistance provided?

2.5.1 What technical assistance was provided?

2.6 What was the reaction of the staff at the replication sites to the program?

2.7 What was the reaction of the Outreach participants to staff development activities?

2.8 What were the demonstration/dissemination activities of the project?

3.0 Instrumentation

3.1 Questionnaire or form to determine characteristics of replication sites: (a) number of children, (b) demographic data, (3) local resources provided, (d) physical facility, (e) staff (to be designed).

3.2 Questionnaire and/or check list to determine: (a) KIDS model implementation, (b) components replicated, (c) extent of replication (to be designed).

3.3 A form utilized to extract basic demographic data on students served in the program from Special Education Data Base and project files (to be designed).

3.4 Questionnaire or form to determine instructional history of students (to be revised).

3.5 Questionnaire to determine participant reaction to: (a) technical assistance provided, (b) the program iteself, (c) staff development activities (to be designed).

3.6 Demonstration/dissemination data collection form (to be designed).

4.0 Design Groups

4.1 Student Population

Treatment	Test	School	Grade	No. Elements
KIDS Outreach	3,4	G. W. Carver	Early Childhood	Approx. 12
		Ben Milam	Early Childhood	Approx. 10
		C. Rice	Early Childhood	Approx. 5
		P. Wheatley	Early Childhood	Approx. 5
		R. E. Lee	Early Childhood	Approx. 7
		L. P. Cowart	Early Childhood	Approx. 4
		L. K. Hall	Early Childhood	Approx. 7
		G. Peabody	Early Childhood	Approx. 2
		Stevens Park	Early Childhood	Approx. 11
		B. Alexander	Early Childhood	Approx. 3
		H. S. Thompson	Early Childhood	Approx. 4
		J. Ireland	Early Childhood	Approx. 6
		E. Titche	Early Childhood	Approx. 14
		B. H. Macon	Early Childhood	Approx. 10
		Arthur Kramer	Early Childhood	Approx. 5
		V. H. Hexter	Early Childhood	Approx. 9
		Duncanville ISD (1)	Early Childhood	Approx. 8
		Grand Prairie ISD (1)	Early Childhood	Approx. 4
		Lancaster ISD (1)	Early Childhood	Approx. 16

4.2 Teacher Population

Treatment	Test	School	No. Elements
KIDS Outreach	1,2,5	G. W. Carver	2
		Ben Milam	1
		C. Rice	1
		P. Wheatley	1
		R. E. Lee	1
		L. P. Cowart	1
		L. K. Hall	1
		G. Peabody	1
		Stevens Park	1
		B. Alexander	1
		H. S. Thompson	1
		J. Ireland	1
		E. Titche	2
		B. H. Macon	2
		Arthur Kramer	1
		V. H. Hexter	1
		Duncanville ISD (1)	1
		Grand Prairie ISD (1)	1
		Lancaster ISD (1)	1

5.0 Data Collection

September 1 - May 31	Ongoing student demographic data collection
January 8 - 12	Collection of classroom observation data (model implementation), and instructional history data
February 5 - 9	Collection of data on replication site characteristics
April 30 - May 11	Classroom observation and instructional history data collection
May 14 - 18	Administration of technical assistance and participant reaction questionnaire

6.0 Data Analysis

Question 2.1	Characteristics of replication sites: tabulation of the number of children and demographic data. Assessment of local resources provided, physical facilities and staff through completion of questionnaire or form.
Question 2.2	Tabulation and summarization of data obtained from KIDS model implementation questionnaire and/or checklist.
Question 2.3	Demographic characteristics of students: frequency tabulation of students by age, gender, ethnicity and handicap.
Question 2.4	Analysis will include frequency distributions and tabulations of student activities and areas of delay.
Question 2.5	Analysis will include brief summary of the technical assistance provided and a tabulation of responses to related questionnaire items.
Question 2.6 & 2.7	Analysis will include tabulation on each item, accompanied by a brief summary of responses to open-ended items.

Question 2.8 Listing of demonstration/dissemination activities.

7.0 Critical Events with Dates

7.1 Obtain program specifications, September 1, 1978

7.2 Orientation for regional replication site participants, September 8, 1978

7.3 Parent Self Appraisal Inventory revised, September 22, 1978

7.4 Preliminary evaluation plan, September 26, 1978

7.5 Preliminary evaluation plan reviewed, October 3, 1978

7.6 Needs and resources determined, October 5, 1978

7.7 Detailed evaluation plan developed, October 9, 1978

7.8 Detailed evaluation plan finalized, October 13, 1978

7.9 Instrument development, October 27, 1978

7.10 Technical assistance provided replication sites, Noverber 10, 1978

7.11 Instrument development, December 15, 1978

7.12 Technical assistance provided replication sites, January 5, 1979

7.13 Classroom observation, instructional history data collection, January 12, 1979

7.14 Instrument development, January 29, 1979

7.15 Replication site characteristics data collection, February 9, 1979

7.16 Technical assistance provided replication sites, February 19, 1979

7.17 Instrument development, April 2, 1979

7.18 Technical assistance provided replication sites, April 9, 1979

7.19 Classroom observation, instructional history data collection, May 11, 1979

7.20 Technical assistance, participant reaction questionnaire administration, May 18, 1979

7.21 End of year data collection, May 31, 1979

7.22 INTERIM REPORT: Technical Assistance and Participant Reaction, June 11, 1979

7.23 INTERIM REPORT: Instructional History, June 20, 1979

7.24 INTERIM REPORT: Model Implementation, July 6, 1979

7.25 INTERIM REPORT: Student Demographic Report, July 20, 1979

7.26 Executive Summary, July 27, 1979

7.27 Abstract, July 31, 1979

8.0 Resource Commitments

8.1 Personnel

Name	Position	Days Committed
Daniel J. Macy	Principal Evaluator	50
Deborah F. C. Gilliam	Assistant Evaluator	134
Jamie L. Carter	Assistant Evaluator	65
Tommie Brown	Secretary	30
Debra J. Coleman	Data Technician II	10

8.2 Special Supplies

Not Applicable

Report Distribution

A. Interim Report

Review	Distribution
Robert P. Grobe	Charles Jones Fannie McClure Carlton Moffett Ruby Morris B. J. Stamps Allen Sullivan Ruth Turner William J. Webster Ruth Wilson

B. Final Report

Review	Distribution before presentation to the Board Evaluation Committee	
Robert P. Grobe William J. Webster	Charles Jones Fannie McClure Carlton Moffett Ruby Morris B. J. Stamps	Allen Sullivan Ruth Turner William J. Webster Ruth Wilson

Distribution after presentation to
the Board Evaluation Committee

Executive Team
Project Staff
Principals of schools involved

I have read this plan and understand the nature of the information to be provided.

Ruth Turner
Ruth Turner
Project Director
Director-Special Education

Allen R. Sullivan
Allen R. Sullivan
Deputy Associate Superintendent
Special Education

Dallas Indepdendent School District
Mr. Linus Wright, General Superintendent

Accountability and Development Division
Mr. Rogers L. Barton
Associate Superintendent

Department of Research, Evaluation,
and Information Systems
Dr. William J. Webster
Assistant Superintendent

PROJECT KIDS THEORETICAL CONTROL GROUP STUDY

Daniel J. Macy, Ph.D.

SP78-110-31-08

Approved report of the Department of Research,
Evaluation, and Information Systems

Daniel J. Macy, Ph.D.
Principal Evaluator-
Research and Evaluation

Robert P. Grobe, Ph.D.
Executive Evaluator-
Special Project Evaluation

William J. Webster, Ph.D.
Department Head

Dallas, Texas
October, 1978

Executive Summary

Project KIDS Theoretical Control Group Study

Evaluator: Daniel J. Macy Approved: Robert P. Hobe

Question 1: What was the reliability of projected scores?

Reliability estimates ranged from .81 to .95 for the scales included in the Bayley Scales of Infant Development and the KIDS Inventory of Development.

Question 2: What was the validity of projected scores?

The professional credentials of the expert panel were judged sufficient to warrant confidence in projected score validity. There was no attempt to investigate validity empirically.

Question 3: Did individual experts exhibit any consistent deviation in projecting scores?

No.

Question 4: Was the variability in projected scores related to children's pretest performance, age, number of items projected, handicap, or extent of available information?

Only age and developmental level were significantly associated with variability in projected scores, but results were not considered conclusive.

Question 5: Was there significant improvement in actual pre-post scores of sampled children?

Yes. On the average, children gained 8 1/2 months on the Bayley mental scale and 7 months on the Bayley motor scale during the 12-month observation period.

Question 6: What were the characteristics of theoretical control scores?

The average score projected by the four-member expert panel was taken as the theoretical control score for each child. Average theoretical control and actual Bayley scores were as follows:

Mental		Motor	
Theoretical Control	Actual	Theoretical Control	Actual
105	113	41	47

Question 7: How did theoretical control scores compare to actual posttest scores?

Actual Bayley motor scale scores of Project KIDS children were significantly ($p < .10$) greater than theoretical control scores. The 90 percent confidence level was justified in order to obtain the statistical power necessary to detect a potentially small difference between group means due to the practical significance of such differences in the Project KIDS population. However, mental scale scores were not significantly greater than control scores.

Abstract

Project KIDS Theoretical Control Group Study

Evaluator: Daniel J. Macy

Objectives of the Project: Project KIDS is a model program for handicapped infant, toddlers, preschool children, and their families. Services are delivered in a home-based training program, center-based infant stimulation classes, and school-based preschool classrooms. The four components of the project are curriculum and appraisal, staff development, parent involvement, and demonstration/dissemination. The major goal of services to children is to improve developmental progress and to utilize parents in a primary role in the instruction of their children.

Purpose of the Evaluation: The purpose of this research study was to obtain control data for use in the product evaluation of Project KIDS. The uniqueness of the children served in the project prevented identification of any comparable group of children to serve as a control group, and other quasi-control group strategies commonly used, such as matched pairs designs or comparison of pre-post developmental rates, applied to the Project KIDS population. Thus, the study developed an innovative research strategy, termed a theoretical control strategy, in order to provide control data for product evaluation of Project KIDS.

The theoretical control strategy requires a panel of experts in child development and early childhood education for the handicapped to project independently test score performance for children on the assumption of no treatment intervention. The average score projected by the panel then becomes the theoretical control score used in comparisons with actual test scores of children. The final purpose of this study was to compare control and actual test scores of Project KIDS children in order to evaluate the effectiveness of project intervention.

Sample: The sample included 17 children and four expert panel members. The four experts were Dr. Bettye Caldwell, University of Arkansas at Little Rock, Dr. Ernest Gotts, University of Texas at Dallas, Dr. Maynard Reynolds, University of Minnesota, and Dr. Francis Walker, California State Department of Education. The 17 children sampled were nonrandomly selected from the initial population of children aged 18 months or younger referred to Project KIDS (pre-post scores were available for only 12 of the 17 sampled children).

Evaluation Design: The design of the study included pre-post observations with the Bayley Scales of Infant Development and post observation with the theoretical control strategy (which used both the Bayley and the KIDS Inventory

of Development). Hence, the design appeared as follows:

O_1 X O_2 (actual Bayley scores),

O_3 (theoretical Bayley scores),

O_4 (theoretical KIDS Inventory scores),

where ----- ----------

O_1 is the Bayley pretest,

X is 12-months' Project KIDS experience,

O_2 is the Bayley posttest,

O_3 is the theoretical post Bayley observation, and

O_4 is the theoretical post KIDS Inventory observation.

The design of the study was superficially similar to the classic experimental-control group design, but the model for data analysis was necessarily the repeated-measures model due to the common dependence of both theoretical and actual scores on the same child.

The evaluation sought to answer the following questions:

1. What was the reliability of projected scores?
2. What was the validity of projected scores?
3. Did individual experts exhibit any consistent deviation in projecting scores?
4. Was the variability in projected scores related to children's pretest performance, age, number of items projected, handicap, or extent of available information?
5. Was there significant improvement in actual pre-post scores of sampled children?
6. What were the characteristics of theoretical control scores?
7. How did theoretical control scores compare to actual posttest scores?

Evaluation Results:

1. Internal consistency reliabilities of projected scores for both the Bayley and KIDS Inventory ranged from .81 to .95, and these reliabilities were considered to be very good, especially in light

of the developmental nature of the theoretical control strategy. The following gives the reliability coefficients for each test scale:

Bayley mental	.81
Bayley motor	.95
KIDS cognitive/language	.91
KIDS gross motor	.90
KIDS fine motor	.93
KIDS self-care	.87

2. The study did not empirically investigate the validity of scores projected by the expert panel. However, the credentials of experts on the panel were judged to have been sufficient to warrant a fair degree of confidence in projected score validity. Additionally, the reported content validity of both the Bayley and KIDS Inventory were sufficiently high, and this factor would logically lead to increased validity in projected scores.

3. There were no significant differences among experts in projected scores. In other words, any given expert was not consistently higher or lower than others in his or her score projections.

4. As expected, there was variability in scores projected by experts for any given child, and the extent of projected score variability differed across children. In other words, experts varied more in projecting scores for child A than for child B, for example. While it seems reasonable that some children would present a more difficult score projection task, the results provided no definitive answer as to which factors might influence expert variability. Chronological age and developmental level were seen to have some association with expert variability, but handicap, number of test items projected, and extent of available information were relatively independent of expert variability.

5. Sampled children made highly significant improvement in developmental progress during the 12-month pre-post observation period. On the average, children gained eight and one-half months on the Bayley mental scale and seven months on the Bayley motor scale.

6. Comparison of theoretical control scores to actual Bayley scores showed that the Project KIDS children performed significantly ($p < .10$) better than the control on the motor scale but not on the mental scale. This indicated that gains were greater on the motor scale than would have been expected without project intervention. The reader should not discount this significant finding, even though the significance level is not at the usual .05 or .01 level. Rather, project intervention should be considered to have made a significant difference just as if the significance level had been .05 or .01.

The rationale for the above conclusion is based on two statistical concepts known as 'power' and 'practical significance'. Power has to do with the probability of finding a significant difference when in fact project intervention is truly effective. If the power of a statistical test is low, there will not be much chance of finding a significant difference between groups even when the treatment is effective. Practical significance applies to the practical meaning of any observed significant difference. In some cases, power can be so great that a very small difference of no practical significance can be statistically significant. An important point is that small differences require considerable power to be statistically significant.

In the case of the Project KIDS evaluation, the difference between the control and treatment scores was relatively small, about one-third a standard deviation, which would usually be considered to have no practical significance. However, Project KIDS served a unique population, unlike that encountered in the usual public school evaluations of reading and math programs. While test items measuring impact of a language arts program would test skills in word recognition, spelling, and so forth, test items measuring impact of Project KIDS tested skills in such basic behaviors as sitting and standing. Thus, improvement in even a few test items would seem to have much more practical significance than in the case of the usual language arts program.

Thus, the statistical test in the case of Project KIDS needed to be relatively powerful in order to detect even a small difference between the control and treatment groups. The 90 percent confidence level was adopted to increase power and to detect any observed difference which would have been significant given a larger sample size in the project evaluation.

The following give the raw score averages and standard deviations for the Bayley scales.

	Mental Scale		Motor Scale[a]	
	Theoretical Control	Actual	Theoretical Control	Actual
Average	104.8	113.0	40.6	47.4
Standard deviation	33.1	42.5	14.6	21.2

[a]Note that only the motor scale difference was statistically significant.

1978-79 PLAN

PROJECT: Second Level Project KIDS Theoretical Control Study

Evaluator: Alberta M. Rogers

1.0 Description and Purpose

Project KIDS is an early intervention project for handicapped children, but one methodological problem in terms of evaluating the project has been the unavailability of suitable control subjects. Thus, a previous study (SP78-105-55-08) was undertaken to investigate the application of an expert panel in projecting posttest scores of children to be used as a control comparison. Results of that study showed the theoretical control approach was feasible and yielded useful control data.

The purpose of this second level study is essentially to secure control data for a larger sample of Project KIDS children and a second panel of experts. This study may also provide further validation of the initial theoretical control study.

2.0 Major Evaluation Questions

2.1 What was the extent of agreement among experts in terms of projected scores?

2.1.1 What was the reliability of scores projected by experts?

2.1.2 What was the validity of scores projected by experts?

2.1.3 Did individual experts exhibit any consistent deviation in projecting scores?

2.1.4 Was the variability in projected scores related to children's pretest performance, related subtest performance, age, number of items rated, or handicap?

2.2 How did actual test score performance of children compare to projected score performance?

3.0 Instrumentation

3.1 Bayley Scales of Infant Development.

3.2 KIDS Inventory of Development.

4.0 Design Groups

4.1 Student Population

Treatment	Test	School	Grade	No. Elements
Project KIDS	1,2	Casa View	EC	5
		E. L. DeGolyer	EC	4
		C. Oliver	EC	6
		Stevens Park	EC	4
		H. C. Withers	EC	4
Control	1,2	Casa View	EC	5
		E. L. DeGolyer	EC	4
		C. Oliver	EC	6
		Stevens Park	EC	4
		H. C. Withers	EC	4

5.0 Data Collection

October 4-11	Compile student profile folders
October 30 - November 3	Collect expert panel projections
November 6 - 10	Collect actual posttest scores

6.0 Data Analysis

Question 2.1	Analysis will address reliability, validity, expert bias, and concommitant variables as specified in subquestions.
Question 2.1.1	Computation of inter-rater reliability estimates as derived from ANOVA, computed separately for Bayley and KIDS Inventory scales.
Question 2.1.2	Comparison of Bayley projected scores from current panel with those of previous panel for selected subsample; computation of Pearson r to yield criterion validity coefficient.

Question 2.1.3	Computation of repeated-measures ANOVA to test for significant expert main effect, computed separately for Bayley and KIDS Inventory projected scores.
Question 2.1.4	The correlation between variability in projected scores and each variable will be computed, analysis done separately for Bayley and KIDS Inventory scores.
Question 2.2	Computation of repeated-measures ANOVA where the mean projected score and the acutal posttest score are the two measures of interest, computed separately for Bayley and KIDS Inventory scores.

7.0 Critical Events with Dates

7.1 Evaluation plan, October 1, 1978

7.2 Case study data collected, October 4, 1978

7.3 Pretest data (KIDS, Bayley) collected, October 6, 1978

7.4 Student profile folders compiled, October 11, 1978

7.5 Projected posttest data collected, November 3, 1978

7.6 Observed posttest data collected, November 10, 1978

7.7 Data analysis, November 17, 1978

7.8 Draft of final report, November 22, 1978

7.9 Report ready for dissemination, November 28, 1978

7.10 Abstract, November 30, 1978

7.11 Executive Summary, December 8, 1978

8.0 Resources Commitments

8.1 Personnel

Name	Position	Days Committed
Daniel J. Macy	Principal Evaluator	5
Alberta M. Rogers	Senior Evaluator	30
Debbie Coleman	Data Technician	3
Tommie Brown	Secretary	

8.2 Special Supplies

None

Report Distribution

A. Interim Reports

Review	Distribution
Robert P. Grobe	Charles Jones Fannie McClure Carlton Moffett Ruby Morris B. J. Stamps Allen Sullivan Ruth Turner William J. Webster

B. Final Report

Review	Distribution before presentation to the Board Evaluation Committee
Robert P. Grobe William J. Webster	Charles Jones Fannie McClure Carlton Moffett Ruby Morris B. J. Stamps Allen Sullivan Ruth Turner William J. Webster
	Distribution after presentation to the Board Evaluation Committee
	Executive Team

I have read this plan and understand the nature of the information to be provided.

Ruth Turner
Project KIDS Director
Director - Special Education

Allen R. Sullivan
Deputy Associate Superintendent
Special Education

Dallas Independent School District
Dr. Nolan Estes, General Superintendent

Development Division
Mr. Rogers L. Barton
Associate Superintendent

Department of Research, Evaluation,
and Information Systems
Dr. William J. Webster
Deputy Associate Superintendent

D.6

PROJECT ZERO REJECT
DALLAS CHILD FIND COMPONENT

SP78-063-31-08

Deborah F. Carpenter Gilliam, M.A.
and
Daniel J. Macy, Ph.D.

Approved report of the Department of Research,
Evaluation, and Information Systems

Deborah F. Carpenter Gilliam, M.A.
Assistant Evaluator
Special Education

Daniel J. Macy, Ph.D.
Principal Evaluator
Special Education

Robert P. Grobe, Ph.D.
Principal Evaluator
Special Program Evaluation

William J. Webster, Ph.D.
Department Head

Dallas, Texas
July, 1978

Executive Summary

Project Zero Reject
Dallas Child Find Component

Evaluators: Deborah F. Carpenter Gilliam
Daniel J. Macy

Approved: Robert P. Hobe

Question 1: What was the most successful means of locating those handicapped children who were not receiving educational services?

Calls from parents, DISD school personnel and various community agencies.

Question 2: What problems, if any, were observed in procuring services for the unserved handicap population?

No specific managerial problems were identified. Placement was established for approximately 64 percent (excluding 94 Mental Health/Mental Retardation Center (MHMR) referrals) of the children referred. The remaining 36 percent as well as the 94 MHMR referrals were still in process as of June 30.

Question 3: What demographic information described the members of the located population?

Ninety-four percent of the children referred (excluding MHMR referrals) were from the target population of out of school and unserved, handicapped children. Gender and ethnic proportions in the located population were as expected, but appeared higher in some areas due to the imbalance noted in the MHMR referral population. Over three-fourths of the referrals were children at or below the elementary school level, with all children having moderate to severe handicapping conditions.

Question 4: What was the general status of those PZR students enrolled in District special education programs during the current school year?

Overall results of the follow-ups on Project Zero Reject students enrolled in District special education programs

were favorable as the majority of the students were said to have "regular" attendance and progressing well in class. Little or no adverse reaction to the students' enrollment was noted on the part of faculty and parents.

Question 5: What three-year trends were noted in terms of the general demography of the located population?

The major referral sources noted each year were parents, DISD personnel and agency personnel. Placement was established for an average of 53 percent of the population over the three years of the project. Over 82 percent of the referrals obtained each year were from the target population of unserved handicapped children with the majority of the children referred being between three and five years of age. The area of mental retardation (primarily on the trainable level) accounted for the majority of the handicapping conditions reported each year.

Question 6: What was the effect of human service agency visitations in terms of project awareness?

Due to revisions in third-year project activities and to the discontinuance of the project newsletter, data were not obtained relative to this item.

Question 7: What kinds and how many students were screened by the DES (Developmental Evaluation Scale)?

The DES was administered to 109 of the 254 referrals received this year; however, data were available (at this writing) only for 75 of the cases assessed with the scale. Nearly two-thirds of the children were males, with an equal number being Anglo and Black (43 percent, respectively). Over three-fourths of the children were in the early childhood age group of three to five year olds.

Question 8: What was the teacher and student reaction to the training activities and the practicum experience directed by the MHMR staff members?

Overall reactions on the part of both teachers and students were generally positive and favorable, with both groups indicating a desire for continued future activities in this area.

Question 9: Did the project implementation successfully complete planned activities?

Overall project implementation was good.

Question 10: What was the relationship, if any, between handicap severity rating and resource consumption?

Analysis of the data revealed that no apparent relationship existed between the extent of involvement data and the resource consumption data. The correlation coefficient was .03.

Abstract

Zero Reject-Dallas Child Find Component

Evaluators: Deborah F. Carpenter Gilliam
Daniel J. Macy

Objectives of the Project: During its third year, the project sought to continue its cooperative effort between the DISD and the Dallas County Mental Health Mental Retardation Center (MHMR) to refine and finalize a model system for locating out of school unserved handicapped children and for a fail-safe referral system to monitor these students from identification through placement. The project continued its 24-hour telephone system and periodic contacts with human service agencies.

The Developmental Evaluation Scale (DES) was used to screen all incoming questionable referrals by completing a revised version of the scale to determine the appropriateness of referral. The project further sought to study the feasibility of utilizing the DES in a public school setting by investigating characteristics of DES scores. Cases referred to the project by all referral sources were to be reviewed, release statements obtained from parents, all available information resources collected and the cases prepared for staffing by the District Admission, Review and Dismissal Committee.

In an effort to assist other school districts in other urban settings in the replication of child find programs within their systems, the project developed a child find manual which provides a broad overview of project activities conducted throughout the duration of the project.

As a part of the project's third-year phasing out activities, a follow-up study was conducted relative to those students located by the project and enrolled in school. The project was further to conduct a follow-up study of mini-workshop training sessions and the related practicum experience at the Human Service Magnet. The third year effort of the project continued its development of a computerized information system to track the placement of students and to aid in long-range planning.

Sample: Nonrandom sampling techniques were utilized for all studies. The sample for the Teacher Training Questionnaire was composed of those 10 developmental center teachers assigned to the District's eight developmental center units and who attended the training sessions at the Human Service Magnet. The sample for the Special Education Work Option Questionnaire consisted of those four high school students who opted to fulfill their work option requirements at the Human Service Magnet. The sample for the Resource Consumption Questionnaire consisted of the teachers of 40 students who at the time of the study, had been referred to the project during the 1976-77 school year, were enrolled in special education during the 1977-78 school year, and who had a completed severity rating. The sample for the Teacher Interview Questionnaire was composed of the teachers of all those students who had pre-

viously been referred to the project (1975-78), and who were enrolled in District special education programs during the current school year (1977-78). The teachers of 92 Project Zero Reject students were contacted for interview by project staff members.

Evaluation Design: The evaluation design utilized for all studies was the "One Shot Case Study" design. The following schemata represent the designs utilized for each study.

developmental center teachers	___X O_1_____ (N=10)
high school students (Human Service Magnet)	___X O_1_____ (N=4)
Project Zero Reject students	_____X O_1__O_2___, where

O_1 = resource consumption study (N=40)

O_2 = student follow-up study (N=92)

Data relative to the teacher training survey and the resource consumption survey were obtained via telephone interviews. The student work option experience data were obtained through a mail-out questionnaire. Data for the student follow-up survey were collected via personal interviews.

The evaluation results are centered around child identification methodologies, the procurement of services (placement) for the located population, referral demographic data and third-year student follow-up data. The results of the analysis of the relationship between extent of handicap involvement and resource consumption, DES data, staff development activities, three-year trends and overall project implementation are also reported.

The project sought to answer the following major evaluation questions:

1. What was the most successful means of locating those handicapped children who were not receiving educational services?

2. What problems, if any, were observed in procuring services for the unserved handicap population?

3. What demographic information described the members of the located population?

4. What was the general status of those PZR students enrolled in District special education programs during the current school year?

5. What three-year trends were noted in terms of the general demography of the located population?

6. What was the effect of human service agency visitations in terms of project awareness?

7. What kinds and how many students were screened by the DES?

8. What was the teacher and student reaction to the training activities and the practicum experience directed by the MHMR staff members?

9. Did the project implementation successfully complete planned activities?

10. What was the relationship, if any, between handicap severity rating and resource consumption?

Evaluation Results:

Child find strategies

1. This year the project reportedly averaged an estimate of 10 telephone calls per day or 200 calls per month. Last year the project logged an estimated average of 18 calls per day or 360 calls per month, while during the first year (1975-76), the project logged a total of 345 calls from the latter part of January through June of that year. The fewer number of calls noted during the third year are believed to be attributed to the project's continued publicity and refinement of referral procedures. However, the data show that the project's 24-hour telephone system has continued to be a widely utilized vehicle for initiating project referrals as the project received a total of 254 referrals from July 1, 1977 through June 30, 1978.

2. The most successful means of locating the targeted population of unserved handicapped children appeared to be through calls from parents, DISD school personnel and various community agencies, all of which accounted for more than 90 percent of the referrals received this school year. The closing of an MHMR facility resulted in over one-half of the referrals being attributed to agencies alone. However, further analysis excluding the MHMR referrals show that approximately one-third of the referrals (32.6 percent) would be attributed to agencies. Last year (1976-77), referrals from parents, DISD school personnel and agencies accounted for more than three-fourths of the referrals received. During the first year (1975-76), referrals from parents and agencies alone accounted for nearly three-fourths of the referrals received. The data show that these three sources (parents, DISD

personnel and agencies) have consistently been the major referral agents for the duration of the project.

3. Various community agencies throughout the Metroplex have been instrumental in providing the child find telephone number to nearly 70 percent of the referents. Last year, agencies provided the child find number to over 50 percent of the referents. District school personnel also contributed significantly in providing the child find telephone number to referents in nearly one-fourth of the referrals. These two sources appear to be the major source for the child find telephone number.

Procurement of services

4. The project was successful in establishing placement for approximately 40 percent of the 254 children referred. However, this figure (40 percent) is confounded by the large number of MHMR referrals. Further analysis of the data show that the percent placed was 63.8 percent excluding the MHMR referrals. During the first and second year of the project, placement was established for approximately 38 percent and 58 percent of the children referred, respectively. The data (excluding third-year MHMR referrals) show a consistent increase from year to year in the provision of services to the located population. As of June 30, the remaining referrals had either been deferred or remained in the appraisal process.

5. Those children who were placed waited an average of 13 weeks from the time of referral to placement. During the first and second year of the project, the average amount of time from referral to placement was 8.1 weeks and 10 weeks, respectively. While the data tend to indicate an increase in the average amount of time from referral to placement from one year to the next, one must consider the fact that the number of referrals received each successive year of the project has also increased with 88, 226 and 254 referrals received, respectively. The percent placed each year (excluding third-year MHMR referrals) also increased in spite of the fact that the PZR appraisal team did not work full-time on the project during the third year.

6. The average case remained in process 7.6 weeks. The average time for these cases to be reviewed was 1.7 weeks while the average amount of time between case reviews and June 30, was 4.6 weeks. In comparison to data obtained in this area during the first and second year of the project, the data show a definite decrease in the amount of time lapsed for those cases designated as "incomplete" as of June 30.

Referral demography

7. Approximately 60 percent of the 254 referrals received this year were from the targeted population of out of school and unserved

handicapped children. Further analysis of the data excluding the MHMR referrals show that approximately 94 percent of the referrals were from the target population. During both the first and second year of the project, approximately 83 percent of the referrals received were from the target population. The data show that the project has been markedly consistent from year to year, in locating its intended population.

8. Data in terms of the age distribution of the 254 referrals received this year are markedly consistent with data obtained in this area from the project's first and second year referrals. Over three-fourths of the referrals received each year have been children at or below the elementary school level, with over one-half of the children being between three and five years of age.

9. The gender and ethnicity percentages within the located population somewhat reflected the expected proportions. The male population has consistently appeared to be over-represented throughout the duration of the project, but the observed proportion of males has been consistent with typical male incidence figures in special education programs. Data in terms of the ethnic backgrounds of the children referred this year were consistent with District proportions except in the MHMR referral population, where Black children were over-represented. Data obtained in this area during the first and second year of the project showed a close degree of consistency with District ethnic percentages.

10. Of the 102 referrals that had their placement determined as of June 30, almost all were children with moderate to severe handicapping problems. The most frequently reported handicap this year as in the past years, was that of mental retardation, with the majority on the trainable level.

11. The extent of handicap involvement data show that about 17 percent of the 97 cases assessed in these areas would be considered severe cases. It was thought that service delivery to these children would require resources not typically available in the routine operation of the special education program. About 21 percent of the referrals were considered "normal" in all categories on the extent of involvement scale.

Student follow-ups

12. Third-year follow-up data on those PZR students enrolled in District special education programs during the 1977-78 school year (N=92) showed that over three-fourths of the students had "regular" attendance records. In terms of peer interaction, special education teachers reported that nearly three-fourths of the students were doing well in this area with little or no problems indicated. Another nine percent were said to be "improving" in this area.

13. The majority of the students were said to be showing significant signs of progress and improvement in their special class. Nearly one-fourth of the students were said to be progressing slowly but definitely making some progress. Teachers cited reasons for some of the students' slow progress in terms of their immaturity and emotional problems. The progress of the remaining students was reportedly poor with teachers citing reasons in terms of poor attendance, short attention spans, and vision and hearing impairments.

14. Special education teachers further indicated that the majority of the PZR students had not posed any particular additional problems in the classroom that they had not had prior to their enrollment. According to some teachers, those problems that had occurred as a result of the remaining PZR students' enrollment included problems in terms of the physical conditions of some students, emotional behavior, health conditions, the lack of toilet training of some students, poor hygiene and the seizures and tantrums of some students.

15. Overall, faculty and parent reactions to the students' enrollment were favorable. The majority of the teachers indicated that the faculty had "accepted" the PZR students while generally displaying favorable positive attitudes towards the students. The majority of the parents were also said to have displayed cooperative favorable attitudes with no problems indicated. The parents were further said to have shown concern and interest in their children by attending meetings and conferences as well as visiting the classroom.

Extent of involvement and resource consumption

16. Extent of handicap involvement data (severity scores) and educational resource consumption data were obtained for 40 students referred to the project during the 1976-77 school year and who were enrolled in special education during the 1977-78 school year. The student obtaining the highest severity rating obtained a score of 21.4. The students with the lowest severity rating obtained scores of 1.2. The mean severity rating score was 7.16. The range for the scores was 21.4. The highest resource consumption score obtained was 33.3 with the lowest score obtained being 11.9. The mean resource consumption score was 18.93. The range for this set of data was also 21.4. Further analysis of the data revealed that no apparent relationship existed between the extent of involvement data and the resource consumption data as a correlation coefficient of only .03 was obtained.

Developmental Evaluation Scale

17. The DES was administered to 109 of the 254 referrals received through the project during the 1977-78 school year. The records of 34 children assessed with the scale were not available

at the time of data collection as the information obtained with the scale was also utilized during the appraisal process. As such, the analysis included the scores obtained from the records of 75 children assessed with the scale.

18. Demographic data obtained from the scales showed that nearly two-thirds of the children assessed with the scale were males, with an equal number of the children reportedly being Anglo and Black (43 percent respectively). The remaining 14 percent of the children were of Mexican-American descent. The children ranged in age from 2-16 years old, with the average age being 4.7 years. Over three-fourths of the children were in the early childhood age group (3-5 years of age).

19. All children were assessed with the revised version of the DES. Scores were based on the number of items responded to "appropriately." Actual scores ranged from 3-26, where a score of 26 was considered a "perfect score." The approximate overall mean score was 18, with a standard deviation of 4.67. The data represent somewhat of a negatively skewed distribution.

20. Item analysis showed that the "appropriate response" was obtained for the majority of the cases assessed for all items except four. Six other items yielded appropriate responses for an average of 62 percent of the sample. Over one-fourth of the sample responded inappropriately to three items on the scale. As last years' analysis of DES scores in terms of those items accounting for the largest number of inappropriate responses included seven of the items discussed in this year's analysis, it is again suggested that these 13 items be considered for use as a first-level screening device. The correlation between scores based on a short form (13 items) and the total DES (26 items) was .87.

Staff development and student participation

21. Data in terms of the teacher training survey showed that special education teachers cited strong points of the training in terms of the individual attention they received in the discussion of their needs, their being able to visit other programs involved in the instruction of severely and profoundly handicapped (SPH) children and the relaxed atmosphere in which the training was conducted. Other strong points cited included a mention of the MHMR staff that conducted the training in terms of helpfulness and knowledge in the area and the fact that the training provided them with an opportunity to do some practical work with the children at the magnet developmental center. The teachers' ability to obtain needed materials and to review curriculum available relative to the instruction of SPH children was also cited as a strong point of the training sessions.

22. Three of the teachers felt that the training had no weak points and added that it was both beneficial and appropriate for their needs as well as being well conducted. However, the remaining teachers cited such weaknesses of the training as the disorganization noted during the initial session, too much flexibility in activities and the tour of the magnet high school. The teachers indicated a need for furtner assistance relative to the instruction of SPH children in terms of language development, infant stimulation, behavior management techniques, the determination of developmental guidelines, feeding, gesture programs and working with autistic children. They further expressed a need for a better approach in dealing with parents, a better understanding of the types of medications the children take and their physical problems as well as more knowledge of adaptive equipment.

23. Suggestions to aid future training included better prior preparation and planning of activities, the inclusion of more personnel involved in the instruction of SPH children and consultation from others knowledgeable in the field. Greater access to materials and resources, more visits to other programs and a look at the training conducted elsewhere was also suggested. In terms of the rated items, an average of 50 percent of the teachers indicated a strong favorable reaction to all of the items.

24. Three of the four students who participated in the Special Education Work Option program indicated that the work option had had some positive effects on their desire to work with SPH children. They cited strong points of their experience in terms of their increased knowledge about the handicapped and special education in general. One student felt the program had no weaknesses. Those weaknesses cited by other students included the lack of teaching specific skills and techniques in working with the children, the lack of more indepth training and not having had more opportunity to work with the children.

25. The students further indicated that they had gained experience, confidence in working with SPH children and knowledge of the special problems that SPH children possess through their work option experience. They further suggested that the work option program should include more "book study," and that students should familiarize themselves with the handicaps and problems of the children as well as with the techniques and procedures employed in the instruction of SPH children. The students indicated that the single most important quality for a teacher of SPH children to possess is patience. Two of the students felt that enthusiasm and energy were also important qualities for the teacher.

Three-year trends

26. The major referral sources noted each year were parents, DISD personnel and agency personnel. Placement was established for an

average of 53 percent of the population over the three years of the project. Over 82 percent of the referrals obtained each year were from the target population of unserved handicapped children with the majority of the children referred being between three and five years of age. The area of mental retardation (primarily on the trainable level) accounted for the majority of the handicapping conditions reported each year.

Project implementation

27. Overall project implementation was good. Virtually all activities were completed with the exception of one, which was deemed unrealistic in light of the previous year's outcomes.

1978-79 PLAN

PROJECT: Evaluation of the 1978-79 Child Find Project

Evaluators: Deborah F. C. Gilliam
Daniel J. Macy

Approved: _____

_____

1.0 Description and Purpose

The District's Child Find effort, now in its fourth year, has become an ongoing integral part of the Dallas Independent School District system. The project continues its efforts toward refining a model system for locating unserved handicapped children in a large urban setting. However, project staff were reduced by 50 percent this year since the project has completed its developmental phase and is now integrated into normal District operating procedures. Project activity during the fourth year will place its greatest emphasis on the child find effort itself and the provision of services to the located population, eliminating other activities conducted during previous years of implementation such as agency visitations, house to house canvasing, and so forth.

The child find activities will continue the 24-hour telephone answering service and will continue to utilize a central administrative screening committee to achieve efficient routing of project referrals. The project will further continue the development and maintenance of information on handicapped students at the local level.

2.0 Major Evaluation Questions

2.1 Who were the agents making referrals to the child find office?

2.1.1 What were the information sources for the child find telephone number?

2.2 What demographic information described the referral population?

2.3 What time lines were noted in procuring services for the target population?

3.0 Instrumentation

3.1 Process evaluation instrument to determine: (a) number of children located, (b) method of location, and (c) information source for telephone number.

3.2 Process evaluation instrument to obtain: (a) basic demographic data, (b) handicapping conditions, and (c) referral populations.

3.3 Process evaluation instrument to determine number of students placed for services by the project and time lines for placement.

4.0 Design Groups

4.1 Student Population

Treatment	Test	School	Grade	No. Elements
Child Find	1,2,3	District-wide	All levels applicable	All children located by project

---

5.0 Data Collection

May 21 - 25	Process Evaluation - data base search for end-of-year status and descriptors on project referrals.

6.0 Data Analysis

Question 2.1	Referral sources: frequency tabulation of project referral sources and information sources for telephone number.
Question 2.2	Referral demography: frequency tabulation of located children by age, gender, ethnicity, population type and handicapping condition.
Question 2.3	Procurement of services: frequency tabulation of the number of children placed for services by the project, and time lines for placement.

7.0 Critical Events with Dates

7.1 Preliminary evaluation plan developed, September 29, 1978

7.2 Rough draft of detailed evaluation plan, October 3, 1978

7.3 Detailed evaluation plan completed, October 6, 1978

7.4 Data base interphase process, December 4, 1978

7.5 Data base interphase process, March 2, 1979

7.6 End of year data collection, May 25, 1978

7.7 INTERIM REPORT: End of Year Process Report, June 8, 1979

7.8 Disseminate report, June 15, 1979

7.9 Data base interphase process, June 22, 1979

7.10 Abstract, June 29, 1979

7.11 Executive Summary, July 6, 1979

8.0 Resource Commitments

8.1 Personnel

Name	Position	Days Committed
Daniel J. Macy	Principal Evaluator	6
Deborah F. C. Gilliam	Assistant Evaluator	15
Jenci Kocsis	Programmer	25
Debra J. Coleman	Data Technician II	5
Tommie Brown	Secretary	10

8.2 Special Supplies

Not Applicable

Report Distribution

A. Interim Reports (Process Report)

Review	Distribution
Robert P. Grobe	B. J. Stamps
	Carlton Moffett
	W. J. Webster
	R. P. Grobe
	Allen Sullivan
	Ruth Turner
	Fannie McClure
	Bettye Stallings

B. Final Report

Review	Distribution before presentation to the Board Evaluation Committee
Robert P. Groce	B. J. Stamps
William J. Webster	Carlton Moffett
	William J. Webster
	Allen Sullivan
	Ruth Turner
	Fannie McClure
	Bettye Stallings
	Charles Jones
	Ruby Morris

Distribution after presentation to the Board Evaluation Committee

Executive Team

I have read this plan and understand the nature of the information to be provided.

Ruth Turner
Ruth Turner
Project Manager

Allen R. Sullivan
Allen Sullivan
Deputy Associate Superintendent -
Special Education

Dallas Independent School District
Dr. Nolan Estes, General Superintendent

Development Division
Mr. Rogers L. Barton
Associate Superintendent

Department of Research, Evaluation,
and Information Systems
Dr. William J. Webster
Deputy Associate Superintendent

SPECIAL EDUCATION DATA BASE

SP78-106-31-08

Daniel J. Macy, Ph.D.

Karen Cortell Reisman, B.S.

Michael A. Holt

Jenci J. Kocsis, M.S.

Approved report of the Department of Research,
Evaluation, and Information Systems

Daniel J. Macy, Ph.D.
Principal Evaluator
Special Education

Robert P. Grobe, Ph.D.
Principal Evaluator
Special Program Evaluation

William J. Webster, Ph.D.
Department Head

Dallas, Texas
July, 1978

Executive Summary

Evaluation of the 1977-78 Special Education Data Base

Evaluators: Karen Cortell Reisman
Michael A. Holt
Jenci J. Kocsis
Daniel J. Macy

Approved: Robert P. Hobe

Question 1: What parameters described the special education data base in terms of record definition and data collection procedures for the 1977-78 school year?

The special education data base, during its third year of operation, continued to provide needed information to designated management. Data gathered by the speech pathologists and educational diagnosticians furnished the information stored in the data base. Primarily, this information consisted of demographic data needed during day-to-day routine of special education management. Guidelines, rationale, and specifications for data collection for this ongoing project are explained in Technical Report No. SE78-106-61-8.

Question 2. What kinds of information were available to decision-makers as a result of the 1977-78 data base operations?

Information was available from the data base for completion of the Annual Special Education Statistical Report to the Texas Education Agency and other TEA reports. Special education managers made use of student and teacher listings as generated periodically as well as current totals and percentages of special education population they requested throughout the year. Refer to Research Report No. SP78-106-52-08 for additional information.

Question 3. What contingency plans, if any, were developed for data base expansion?

Modifications proposed for the 1978-79 data base include revisions of certain coding specifications, and expansion to the computer file involving some internal program changes. A planning document was also written during the 1977-78 year proposing a "tracking system" to be used in the future.

This tracking system was designed out of a need to have readily accessible information outlining the specific special education services the student has received as part of the DISD program. However, budget limitations precluded further development of this project and current plans are to attempt to incorporate this task in the following year's budget.

Abstract

Special Education Data Base

Evaluator: Karen Cortell Reisman, Michael A. Holt, Jenci J. Kocsis, Daniel J. Macy

Objective of the Project: The special education data base evolved three years ago to meet the increasing information needs of both special and regular education administrators. These needs arose from a host of administrative tasks and issues including budget and program planning, federal and state reporting requests, student enrollment and appraisal/placement monitoring, due process procedures, and the need for more precise and accountable management. During its third year of operation, the data base, maintained by Department of Research, Evaluation, and Information Systems personnel, continued to provide needed information to designated management.

Data gathered by the speech pathologists (N=78) and the educational diagnosticians (N=24) furnished the information stored in the data base. Primarily, this information consisted of demographic data about students needed during day-to-day routine of special education management. The speech pathologist or diagnostician recorded the data on master coding forms. All variables, excluding the name, were written in an alpha or numeric code. The coding forms were mailed on a daily basis to a central office where they were validated, keypunched, and entered to the computer file. Guidelines, rationale, and specifications for data collection for this ongoing project are explained in Technical Report No. SE78-106-61-8.

The basic functions of the 1977-78 special education data base were to maintain and build onto the existing computer file, and continue to provide computer listings to special education administrators. Variations of student and faculty rosters, current to the week of distribution, were given to special education coordinators, other special education management, diagnosticians, and the pathologists, corresponding to six-week District reporting periods.

A major objective of the data base was the generation of reports to the Texas Education Agency (TEA) necessary for funding purposes. The Fall and Spring TEA Survey Packages generated the total number of children between ages 3-5 and ages 6-21 by handicapping condition. The Elementary and Secondary School Civil Rights Survey tallied, by each school, total special education students by sex, race, and handicap. Finally, statistical tabulations essential for the Annual Special Education Statistical Report to the TEA were generated by a set of computer routines developed during the 1975 year by Information Systems personnel.

Sample: The sample for the data base included the special education staff

(N=840) and all the students who received special education services (N=9,244) during the 1977-78 school year. There were ten identifiable groups of special education teachers:

1) Special education management staff
2) Teachers of special class units on DISD campuses
3) Teachers of special class units at non-DISD campuses
4) Speech pathologists
5) Educational diagnosticians
6) Non-DISD teachers at non-DISD campuses (contracted services)
7) Teachers in the regional-deaf program
8) Teachers in the hospital-homebound program
9) Teachers in the blind-visual program
10) Teacher aids.

Evaluation Design: The concept of an evaluation design was not generally applicable to the data base study, but the following three evaluation questions provide a framework for reporting results.

1. What parameters described the special education data base in terms of record definition and data collection procedures for the 1977-78 year?

2. What kinds of information were available to decision-makers as a result of the 1977-78 data base operations?

3. What contingency plans, if any, were developed for data base expansion?

Evaluation Results:

1. The special education data base in its third year of operation, was successfully utilized to generate information needed by special education management in the day-to-day operations of the program.

2. Information was available from the data base for completion of the Annual Special Education Statistical Report to the Texas Education Agency. Special education managers also made use of student and teacher listings as generated periodically thoughout the year. These lists provided a central information source that was available for quick reference and that was the most current possible.

3. Two specific computer programs, the tabulator program and extractor program, were written for the 1977-78 data base such that spontaneous information requested by management could be easily accessed and reported. The types of information requested usually dealt with totals and percentages of special education students with race, subdistrict, age, or handicap as potential variables.

4. The following reports were generated for management use:

   1) Faculty rosters disseminated every sixth week
   2) Student rosters disseminated every sixth week
   3) Fall TEA Survey Package
   4) Spring TEA Survey Package
   5) Elementary and Secondary School Civil Rights Survey
   6) Annual Special Education Statistical Report to the TEA
   7) Letters to the special education parents
   8) Mailing labels
   9) Miscellaneous reports and tabulations

5. A computerized method of class scheduling for the 1978-79 school year was implemented in the summer months, using the same process designed in the previous year. The method, which minimized work time considerably, was executed with the close cooperation of the coordinators and their facilitators.

6. The additional functions of and revisions to the 1977-78 special education data base were:

   1) Collection of missing student adaptive education numbers.
   2) Collection of student appraisal status by educational diagnosticians earlier in the year.
   3) Addition of students in separate special education programs, such as the blind/visual section, to the data base as an ongoing procedure.
   4) Conversion of master data base tapes of previous two years to a standardized format to be retained on an archive tape.
   5) Generation of rosters by classroom unit rather than by school.
   6) Expansion of data base to accommodate the reporting needs of special education students eligible for transportation.

7. Modifications proposed for the 1978-79 data base include:

   1) Revision of certain coding specifications.

2) More expansion to the computer file.

3) Internal program changes to the computer file.

4) Improvement of feedback communication with special education staff.

8. While the current data base represents a significant contribution to managerial needs of special education, it was thought that the data base was not yet fully developed in terms of potential computer applications and management information needs. Therefore a "Monitoring System" was designed by data base staff out of a need to have readily accessible information outlining the specific special education services the student had received as part of the DISD program. Due to financial limitations however, the purchase of the terminals necessary for the program was considered unfeasible and current plans are to attempt to incorporate computer financing in the following year's budget.

1978-79 PLAN

PROJECT: Special Education Data Base

Evaluators: Daniel J. Macy, Karen Cortell Reisman, Michael A. Holt, and Jenci J. Kocsis

1.0 Description and Purpose

The special education computer data base evolved four years ago to meet the increasing information needs of both special and regular education administrators. Beginning its fourth year of operation, the data base will continue to provide needed information to designated management. The two basic functions of the 1978-79 special education data base will be to maintain and build onto the existing computer file and continue to provide computer listings of students and faculty to special education administrators.

2.0 Major Evaluation Questions

2.1 What parameters described the special education data base in terms of record definition and data collection procedures for the 1978-79 year?

2.2 What kinds of information were available to decision-makers as a result of the 1978-79 data base operations?

2.2.1 What were the number and frequency of kinds of data generated on a routine, periodic basis?

2.2.2 What were the number and frequency of kinds of data disseminated on request by management?

2.3 What plans were developed and implemented for the computerized control of special education instructional equipment and materials?

2.4 What contingency plans, if any, were developed for data base expansion?

3.0 Instrumentation

The project will involve no measurement instruments in the usual sense. Information collection forms will be developed as needed.

4.0 Design Groups

All special education students and faculty in the Dallas Independent School District.

5.0 Data Collection

May 22 - August 21	Collection of initial student information from special education coordinators and facilitators to develop and formulate start up rosters.
July 3 - August 25	Collection of initial information for faculty organizational file.
August 1 - May 31	Collection of transportation information from the central office and county.
September 1 - May 31	Routine update of faculty information on a monthly basis.
September 11 - 29	Collection of initial update and new student data from diagnosticians and speech pathologists and special campuses.
September 29 - May 31	Routine update of student information on a weekly basis by diagnosticians and speech pathologists.
September 29 - May 31	Routine update of student information within blind-visual program, region deaf program, and hospital-homebound program on a six-week basis.
April 30 - May 18	Collection of end-of-year data on pregnant students as well as all other special education students.
April 30 - May 18	Collection of student appraisal status by diagnosticians.
June 4 - August 31	Collection of initial student information to develop and formulate start up rosters for 1979-80 school year.

6.0 Data Analysis

Question 2.1	Data gathered by designated personnel in the District will furnish the information stored in this data base. Primarily, this information consists of demographic data about students needed during day-to-day routine of special education management. This information will be used to provide a complete computerized data file of special education personnel and students which can be readily updated with new inputs as changes and alterations in data occur.

Question 2.2

Of the routine reports, some are generated every sixth week, some are printed bi-annually, and the statistical report to the Texas Education Agency will be disseminated at the end of the school year. The data collected will permit routine generation of the following:

Rosters of special education personnel in alphabetical order and by sub-district.

Rosters of special education students in alphabetical order, numeric order, and by campus/class location.

Reports generated for TEA, necessary for funding purposes, listing students in various ways by sex, race, age, and handicap.

The types of information requested at any given time by management usually will deal with totals and percentages of special education students with race, subdistrict, age or handicap as potential variables. Computer generated mailing labels will also be needed at different times.

Question 2.3

It was felt necessary by special education management to develop a comprehensive inventory system of special education equipment and instructional materials. In order to implement this, plans will be initiated to document and catalogue all such items on a computerized file.

Question 2.4

While the current data base represents a significant contribution to managerial needs of special education, it is thought that the data base has not yet been fully developed in terms of potential computer application and management information needs. Hence, it is thought that further planning is advisable.

7.0 Critical Events with Dates

7.1 Implement process of computerized method of class scheduling with special education coordinators and facilitators, May 22 - August 21, 1978.

7.2 Collect initial information for the faculty file, July 3 - August 31, 1978.

7.3 Disseminate student rosters divided into classes to principals, August 3, 1978.

7.4 Update data base with transportation information as an ongoing process, August 1, 1978 - May 31, 1979.

7.5 Disseminate fall start-up rosters and conduct orientation of data base procedures with diagnosticians and speech pathologists, respectively, August 21, August 23, 1978.

7.6 Meet with supervisors of Hospital-Homebound, Blind-Visual, and Region Deaf programs to conduct orientation on reporting procedures, August 24, 1978.

7.7 Routine collection, verification, keypunch and update of faculty information on a monthly basis, August 28, 1978 - May 31, 1979.

7.8 Routine collection, verification, keypunch and update of student data on a daily and weekly basis by diagnosticians and speech pathologists, August 28, 1978 - May 31, 1979.

7.9 Routine collection, verification, keypunch, and update of student data within special programs (mentioned in #7.6) on a six-week basis, August 28, 1978 - May 31, 1979.

7.10 Generate and disseminate student and faculty rosters every six weeks, August 28, 1978, October 6, 1978, November 21, 1978, January 19, 1979, March 2, 1979, April 13, 1979, May 31, 1979.

7.11 Generate missing data list and TEA Fall Survey Package and the Elementary and Secondary School Civil Rights Survey, respectively, September 19, September 29, 1978.

7.12 Maintain Child Find data base, running batch updates twice a month, September 18, 1978 - May 31, 1979.

7.13 Generate monthly Child Find reports to TEA, September 18, 1978 - May 31, 1979.

7.14 Prepare and disseminate a specification's report documenting 1978-79 data base field definitions and update procedures, (SP78-106-51-08), September 25 - October 31, 1978.

7.15 Provide routine interface update with system-wide data base, October 2, 1978 - May 31, 1979.

7.16 Develop any necessary additional maintenance and report software to upgrade system and provide better utilization of resources, October 2, 1978 - August 31, 1979.

7.17 Develop and implement the Computerized Monitoring Retrieval (CMR) System in all subdistricts, contingent on purchasing of computer terminals.

7.18 Develop and/or implement a system for computerized control of special education instructional equipment and materials, November 1, 1978 - May 31, 1979.

7.19 Determine information needs for data base expansion with special education management. November 1 - December 15, 1978.

7.20 Generate missing data list and TEA Spring Survey Package and the Elementary and Secondary School Civil Rights Survey, respectively, January 10, January 19, 1979.

7.21 Prepare and disseminate Users Reference Manual for extractor, and revise and update Tabulator Manual, January 2 - February 28, 1979.

7.22 Prepare and disseminate Systems Reference Manual to document computer data base operations, March 1 - April 30, 1979.

7.23 Collect, verify, and keypunch all end-of-year data, appraisal status, and missing data on all special education students, including pregnant students and special campuses, April 30 - May 18, 1979.

7.24 Convert student master file to TEA report compatible file, June 1, 1979.

7.25 Generate TEA Annual Special Education Statistical Report, June 15, 1979.

7.26 Determine and enact a procedure to update computer file with fall 1979 class assignments, June 4 - August 27, 1979.

7.27 Prepare and dissemiante 1978-79 Special Education Data Base Status Report (SP79-106-52-08), July 9 - 31, 1979.

7.28 Complete Abstract SP79-106-31-08 and Executive Summary, July 31, 1979.

8.0 Resources Commitments

8.1 Personnel

Name	Position	Days Committed
Daniel J. Macy	Principal Evaluator	42
Karen Cortell Reisman	Assistant Evaluator	170
Michael A. Holt	Programmer Analyst	170
Jenci J. Kocsis	Senior Programmer	170
Debbie Coleman	Data Technician	65
Tommie F. Brown	Secretary	35
Temporary Workers	—	6

8.2 Special Supplies

Type	Quantity	Must Be Ordered By
NCR duplicate form	3000	August 28, 1978

Report Distribution

A. Interim Reports (Specifications Report, Status Report)

Review	Distribution
Robert P. Grobe	B. J. Stamps Charles O. Chowning Charles Jones Fannie McClure Ruby Morris Allen Sullivan Ruth Turner William J. Webster Carlton Moffett

B. Final Report

Review	Distribution before presentation to the Board Evaluation Committee
Robert P. Grobe William J. Webster	B. J. Stamps Charles O. Chowning Charles Jones Fannie McClure Ruby Morris Allen Sullivan Ruth Turner William J. Webster Carlton Moffett

Distribution after presentation to the Board Evaluation Committee

Richard Adams	Janis Kasparian
Ron Chew	Laverne Marr
Betty Clark	Martha Martin
Margarite Domatti	Maria Martinez
Celia Gibson	Robbie Pipkin
Jack Gilliam	Clydia Steenson
Laverne Hopkins	Dorothy Weeks

I have read this plan and understand the nature of the information to be provided.

Allen R. Sullivan

Al Sullivan
Executive Team Member

Dallas Independent School District
Dr. Nolan Estes, General Superintendent

Development Division
Mr. Rogers L. Barton
Associate Superintendent

Department of Research, Evaluation,
and Information Systems
Dr. William J. Webster
Deputy Associate Superintendent

SPECIAL EDUCATION PROCESS EVALUATION

SP78-066-31-08

Daniel J. Macy, Ph.D.

Approved report of the Department of Research,
Evaluation, and Information Systems

Daniel J. Macy, Ph.D.
Principal Evaluator
Special Education

Robert P. Grobe, Ph.D.
Principal Evaluator
Special Program Evaluation

William J. Webster, Ph.D.
Department Head

Dallas, Texas

Executive Summary

Special Education Process Evaluation

Evaluator: Daniel J. Macy Approved: Robert P. Shobe

Question 1: How many students were served in special education?

9,244 This was 6.84 percent of the total District enrollment.

Question 2: How does the number of students served compare to the previous year and to national estimates of incidence?

A substantial increase over the two previous years. While there is no statistically sound basis for determining if the District is serving the expected number of students, P.L. 94-142 cites a 12 percent incidence rate, but survey data from large city schools indicate an average incidence rate of about seven percent. It is unclear whether or not the District is providing services to all students in need of special service.

Question 3: What was the profile of the total special education population in terms of grade, sex, ethnicity, and primary handicap?

About 60 percent was in the elementary school level (in terms of chronological age), and about 60 percent was male. Ethnic percents were 42% Anglo, 45% Black, and 12% Mexican-American. The most predominant handicaps were speech, retardation, and learning disability.

Question 4: How do the percents of ethnic representation in special education compare to total District ethnic percents?

They are comparable. Minority students tended to be underrepresented in special education.

	Ethnic Percents		
	A	B	MA
Total District	35.5	48.2	15.2
Special Education	41.6	45.3	12.4

Question 5: What were the instructional arrangements of students?

The resource room was the most predominant with about one-third of special students (excluding speech students) receiving regular classroom instruction for more than 50 percent of the day.

Question 6: How many students were dismissed?

About 16 percent of the total special education population (N = 1475).

Abstract

Special Education Process Evaluation

Evaluator: Daniel J. Macy

Objectives of the Project: The District special education program attempts to provide appropriate education for every exceptional child. Special education makes use of a continuum of instructional arrangements which range from complete regular classroom instruction to total self-contained instruction in a special campus setting. The program attempts to provide individualized instruction for each student.

Purpose of the Evaluation: The evaluation conducted was a limited process evaluation of the implementation and operation of the special education program. As such, the evaluation yielded only basic information about program operation. Limited comparisons were made with process results from the previous two years.

Sample: The sample included the total student population served in special education.

Evaluation Design: The evaluation used a very simple one-shot observational design, and the time of data collection was June 30, 1978. The data source was the special education computerized data base which is maintained by special education staff and research and evaluation personnel.

The evaluation sought to answer the following questions:

1. How many students were served in special education?
2. How does the number of students served compare to the previous year and to national estimates of incidence?
3. What was the profile of the total special education population in terms of grade, sex, ethnicity, and primary handicap?
4. How do the percents of ethnic representation in special education compare to total District ethnic percents?
5. What were the instructional arrangements of students served?
6. How many students were dismissed?

Evaluation Results:

1. Special education served a total of 9,244 students during the 1976-77 year. This was 6.84 percent of the otal District student population; 5.67 and 5.78 percents were served during the previous two years. Since the legitimacy of national incidence rates is questionable, there is no sound statistical basis for determining if the District is serving the expected number of children. While P.L. 94-142 cites a 12 percent incidence rate, survey data from large city schools indicate an average incidence rate of about seven percent.

2. The percent of total students served in special education for subdistricts varied from 8.0 percent in the Southeast subdistrict to 4.0 percent in the East Oak Cliff subdistrict. The percent served was about 6.0 in the remaining three subdistricts. The data suggested a need to review referral procedures in the East Oak Cliff subdistrict.

3. Most District students were eligible for special education by reason of speech handicap, mental retardation, or learning disability. About 60 percent of special student population was in the elementary school level, and about 60 percent was male.

4. The ethnic representation in the special education population was comparable to total District ethnic representation, and there was a slight trend for minorities to be underrepresented in special education

	Ethnic Percents		
	A	B	MA
Total District	35.5	48.2	15.2
Special Education	41.6	45.3	12.4

5. The resource room was the most frequently used instructional arrangement, and about one-third of the special students (excluding speech students) attended a regular classroom for more than 50 percent of the day. When speech students were counted, about one-half the special students attended a regular classroom for more than 50 percent of the day. About 16 percent of the students was dismissed from special education.

1978-79 PLAN

PROJECT: Special Education Context Evaluation

Evaluator: Daniel J. Macy

1.0 Description and Purpose

The purpose of this study is to provide a limited context evaluation of the total Special Education program. The primary data source will be the special education data base, and most information will be in terms of the numbers and kinds of students served. Information collected will provide a first level description of the special education program and will permit comparison to similar information collected during the previous year.

2.0 Major Evaluation Questions

2.1 How many students were served in special education?

2.2 How does the number of students served compare to the previous year and to national estimates of incidence?

2.3 What was the profile of the total student population in terms of grade, sex, ethnicity, and primary handicap?

2.4 How do the percents of ethnic representation in special education compare to total District ethnic percents?

2.5 What were the instructional arrangements of students served?

2.6 How many students were dismissed?

3.0 Instrumentation

3.1 Extract from special education data base for the 1978-79 year: (a) number of students, (b) grade, (c) sex and ethnicity, (d) handicap, (e) instructional arrangement.

3.2 Extract from District-wide data base: (a) ethnicity.

4.0 Design Groups

4.1 Student Population

Treatment	Test	School	Grade	No. Elements
Special education	1	District-wide	EC-12	Approx. 10,000
Control	2	District-wide	K-12	Approx. 140,000

5.0 Data Collection

June 1 - 15	Collection of selected data from computer files

6.0 Data Analysis

Question 2.1	Simple tabulation of total kids served in special education.
Question 2.2	Comparison of number served to previous years and estimates of national incidence.
Question 2.3	Computation of the percent of the total population within each grade, sex, ethnicity, and primary handicap.
Question 2.4	Comparison of ethnic percents in special education to percents in total District.
Question 2.5	Tabulation of special students according to end of year instructional arrangement.
Question 2.6	Computation of the percent of total population dismissed.

7.0 Critical Events with Dates

7.1 Secure District ethnic data, July 26

7.2 Review TEA statistical report, July 31

7.3 Compute necessary calculations, August 1-4

7.4 Write final report, August 7-9

7.5 Audit final report, August 10

7.6 Write abstract and executive summary, August 11

7.7 Edit final draft of abstract and executive summary, August 14

7.8 Turn in abstract and executive summary to department, August 15

8.0 Resource Commitments

8.1 Personnel

Name	Position	Days Committed
Daniel J. Macy	Principal Evaluator	
Michael A. Holt	Programmer	
Tommie F. Brown	Secretary	

8.2 Special Supplies

None

Report Distribution

A. Interim Reports (Literature Review, Process Reports, I, II)

None

B. Final Report

Review	Distribution before presentation to the Board Evaluation Committee
Robert P. Grobe	B. J. Stamps
William J. Webster	Allen Sullivan
	Ruth Turner
	Charles Jones
	Charles Chowning
	Fannie McClure
	Jean Edwards
	Betty Clark
	Celia Gibson
	Dorothy Weeks
	Maria Martinez
	Janis Kasparian
	Robbie Pipkin

I have read this plan and understand the nature of the information to be provided.

Allen R. Sullivan
Deputy Associate Superintendent-
Special Education

Dallas Independent School District
Mr. Linus Wright, General Superintendent

Accountability and Development Division
Mr. Rogers L. Barton
Associate Superintendent

Department of Research, Evaluation,
and Information Systems
Dr. William J. Webster
Assistant Superintendent

EVALUATION OF THE STRUCTURED ENVIRONMENT FOR THE EMOTIONALLY DISTURBED (SEED) PROJECT

SP79-430-11-08

Donald E. Hawkins, B.A.S.
and
Alberta M. Rogers, M.Ed.

Approved report of the Department of Research, Evaluation, and Information Systems

Daniel J. Macy, Ph.D.
Principal Evaluator
Special Education

Robert P. Grobe, Ph.D.
Executive Evaluator-
Special Project Evaluation

William J. Webster, Ph.D.
Department Head

Dallas, Texas
November, 1978

PROJECT: Evaluation of the Structured Environment for the Emotionally Disturbed (SEED) Project

Evaluators: Donald E. Hawkins
Alberta M. Rogers

1.0 Description and Purpose

The Structured Environment for the Emotionally Disturbed (SEED) Project will involve carefully sequenced experiences for certain pupils on all grade levels (K-12) who have been diagnosed as severely emotionally disturbed. It is hoped that the project will set a model to be used to help provide individualized training for the handicapped as specified by Public Law 94-142. The project is designed to provide a procedure to reintegrate the students to a least restrictive environment and eventually into the regular classroom. The three level structured environment will involve behavior technology, curriculum intervention, parental involvement, and individual and group conseling. It will utilize such facilities (concepts) as Break rooms, Time-Out rooms, and Crisis rooms as well as such personnel as psychologists and educational diagnosticians to help the student meet his/her fullest potential both in terms of academic achievement and social development.

The evaluation of Project SEED will focus on providing decision-makers with information relative to the degree of program implementation, the attitudes of teachers, staff members, parents, and students toward the program, and the achievements of the students. The impact of the project upon the delivery of services to the severely emotionally disturbed and the extent to which the students developed in terms of more socially acceptable behavior will be stressed as program outcomes. Changes in the rate of disciplinary referrals, suspensions, disruptive classroom behaviors, truancy drop-outs and changes in self-concepts for the students will be some of the major determinants. The feasibility of adapting the program to other schools and settings will also be investigated.

2.0 Major Evaluation Questions

2.1 What is the environment of the SEED project?

2.1.1 What are the characteristics of the school sites?

2.1.2 What are the characteristics of the students?

2.1.3 What are the characteristics of the teachers and staff?

2.2 Is the SEED project implemented as specified?

2.2.1 Are specified facilities available?

2.2.2 Are specified teachers and staff members available?

2.2.3 Are the curriculum interventions made throughout the program as specified?

2.2.4 What evidence is there that parental involvement is encouraged and supported throughout the program?

2.2.5 To what extent is therapeutic intervention maintained through group and individual counseling techniques?

2.2.6 Are the behavior management strategies carried out as specified through all levels of the program?

2.3 How does the SEED project differ from other District programs for dealing with the emotionally disturbed?

2.4 To what degree is the project successful in developing a model for movement from a restrictive to a least restrictive educational environment?

2.4.1 How many students moved from Level I to Level II, from Level II to Level III, and from Level III to regular classrooms?

2.4.2 How many students regressed from an attained level back to a previous level and to what extent did this occur?

2.5 How do disciplinary referrals and suspension rates for project students compare with baselines and the control group?

2.6 To what extent was disruptive behavior of project students reduced in frequency?

2.7 What was the rate of project students dropping out compared to DISD drop-out rate?

2.8 To what extent was the truancy rate of project students reduced?

2.9 How did the academic achievement of students who participated in the project compare to that of the control group?

2.10 To what extent did students display increased positive self-concept?

2.11 What was the impact upon parental attitudes toward the school and toward the child?

2.12 To what extent can this model be adapted to any high school and/or elementary school setting?

2.13 What are the cost considerations involved in developing and implementing the SEED project?

2.13 What are the start-up costs?

2.13 What are the costs for continuation of the project after start-up?

2.14 What is the reaction of teachers, staff members, and administrators to the project?

3.0 Instrumentation

3.1 Needs Assessment Survey for teachers and staff.

3.2 Participatory Survey for teachers and staff.

3.3 Attitudinal Questionnaire for parents.

3.4 Student Profile to determine:

(a) frequency and style of parental contacts
(b) frequency and style of student movement between levels
(c) number of suspensions and disciplinary referrals
(d) number of times students are fined social points
(e) attendance
(f) number of drop-outs
(g) number completing program
(h) number of referrals back to regular school
(i) number of referrals to other settings

3.5 Peabody Individual Achievement Test (PIAT).

3.6 Wide Range Achievement Test (WRAT).

3.7 Instrument(s) for students to determine self-concept.

3.8 Classroom Observation Checklist.

3.9 Reaction Questionnaire to determine attitudes of special and regular education staff to the program.

4.0 Design Groups

4.1 Student Population

Treatment	Instrument	School	Grade	No. of Students
SEED	4, 5, 6, 7, 8	Hillcrest	7-12	17
	4, 5, 6, 7, 8	Withers	K-6	17
CONTROL	4, 5, 6, 7		7-12	17
	4, 5, 6, 7		K-6	17

4.2 Teacher and Staff Population

Treatment	Instrument	School	No. of Staff
SEED	1, 2, 9	Hillcrest	11
		Withers	7

4.3 Parent Population

Treatment	Instrument	School	No. of Parents
SEED	3, 4	Withers	Approx. 17
		Hillcrest	Approx. 17

5.0 Data Collection

November 17, 1978	Administration of Needs Survey and Teacher and Staff Participatory Survey (1, 2)
January 1-14, 1979 May 14-18, 1979	Administration of Peabody Individual Achievement Test and Wide Range Achievement Test; pre- and posttests (5.6)
January 15-19, 1979 May 14-18, 1979	Test of Self-Concept administered; pre- and posttests (7)
March 5-9, 1979	Classroom observations and completion of checklist (8)
May 1-11, 1979	Administration of Attitudinal questionnaire for parents (3) and Reaction Questionnaire (9)
January 8-May 25, 1979	Process Evaluation I (4)

6.0 Data Analysis

Question 2.1	Tabulation of data from Special Education data base, Student Profile, and Participatory Survey.
Question 2.2	Descriptive summary of data from Classroom Observation Checklist and Process Evaluation.
Question 2.3	Comparison of SEED project design and specifications with other classrooms in the District for Emotionally disturbed students.
Question 2.4	Tabulation of frequency distribution for data from Student Profile.
Question 2.5, 2.6, 2.7 and 2.8	Tabulation of data from Student Profiles. Data will be compared to base-line data and to data collected for an appropriate control group using an analysis of variance technique.
Question 2.9	Tabulation of scores on PIAT and WRAT comparing treatment and control groups. An analysis of variance technique will be used to determine statistical significance of observed change in the pre/post testing and observed differences between groups.
Question 2.10	Comparison of pre/post scores on an appropriate test of self-concept. Analysis of variance will be used.
Question 2.11	Tabulation of data obtained from Attitudinal Questionnaire for parents.
Question 2.12	Narrative summary of program personnel, equipment and physical facility requirements obtained from Process Evaluation, Classroom Observation Checklist, and Reaction Questionnaire.
Question 2.13	Tabulation of costs from program budget summaries.
Question 2.14	Tabulation of data from Reaction Questionaire.

7.0 Critical Events with Dates

7.1 Preliminary evaluation plan developed, November 15, 1978

7.2 Process information instruments (1, 2) developed, November 15, 1978

7.3 Pre-test data collected (1, 2), November 17, 1978

7.4 Process information instruments (4, 8) developed, January 12, 1979

7.5 Treatment and control groups identified, January 12, 1979

7.6 Pre-test data collected (5, 6, 7), January 1-14, 1979

7.7 Process information instruments (3, 9) developed, February 9, 1979

7.8 Process information collected (4), January 8-May 25, 1979

7.9 Process information collected (8), March 5-9, 1979

7.10 Post-test data collected (2, 5, 6, 7), May 18, 1979

7.11 Process information collected (3, 9), May 11, 1979

7.12 Analysis of data, May 28-31, 1979

7.13 First draft of final report written, June 8, 1979

7.14 Final report completed, June 22, 1979

7.15 Report ready for dissemination, June 29, 1979

8.0 Resources Commitments

8.1 Personnel

Name	Position	Days Committed
Daniel J. Macy	Principal Evaluator	10
Alberta M. Rogers	Senior Evaluator	60
Donald E. Hawkins	Assistant Evaluator	120
Mike Holt	Programmer/Analyst	20
Tommie Brown	Secretary	25
Debra Coleman	Data Technician	10

Report Distribution

A. Final Report

Review	Distribution before presentation to the Board Evaluation Committee
Daniel J. Macy	Carlton Moffett
Robert P. Grobe	Ruby Morris
William J. Webster	Jerome Himes
	Stephen Morris
	Martha Martin
	Allen Sullivan
	Ruth Turner
	Otto Fridia
	George Reid

I have read this plan and understand the nature of the information to be provided.

Ruby P. Morris
Deputy Associate Superintendent
Pupil Personnel Services

Stephen Morris
Project Manager
Secondary

Jerome Himes
Project Manager
Elementary

101